

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

A N D

THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE, Vol. X.
REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES, Vol. V.

NOVEMBER, 1893.

No. 1.
No. 1.

THE AMERICAN CHURCHES.

AMORY H. BRADFORD.

It is now about two years since THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES was started in England under the general editorship of the Rev. Dr. Henry S. Lunn, and the special editorship of Archdeacon Farrar, representing the Established Church of England; the Rev. Donald Frazer, D.D., the Presbyterian Church; the Rev. Alexander Mackennal, D.D., the Congregational Church; the Rev. John Clifford, D.D., the Baptist Church; and Mr. P. W. Bunting, editor of *The Contemporary Review*, the Wesleyan Church. The desire to do something toward promoting the re-union of Christendom was the inspiring motive which led to the starting of this Review, and in its pages have been published the remarkably valuable series of addresses delivered at the Re-union Conferences at Grindelwald and at Lucerne.

The success of THE REVIEW in meeting a long-felt want in the English churches of all denominations, and the already large number of subscribers on this side of the water, has at last and inevitably led to plans for its re-publication in the United States. In assuming a measure of editorial responsibility for the American edition, it is perhaps wise for me to come to a somewhat definite understanding with those who will read THE REVIEW. At present the new matter will be confined almost exclusively to the department entitled "The American Churches." Later, it is hoped that the number of original articles may be increased, but for the present, with the exception of this department, the matter will be a re-publication of what has first appeared elsewhere. In assuming this position, the American editor desires to emphasize the fact that it will be his aim to keep ever at the front the great object which led to the first publication of this Review, namely, the Re-union of Christendom. To help a little toward the realization of that lofty and sublime ideal will ever be our aim. As one, and, indeed, the chief means of promoting that end, we shall endeavor to put before our readers the salient events as they occur in the various denominations of the Church of Christ in America, believing that the first step toward re-union must be a better under-

standing of the principles and prejudices of those from whom we differ. Re-union will never be realized by ignoring the differences between the various branches of the catholic Christian community, but it will be promoted by a clearer and truer understanding of those differences and their causes, and by mutual help in giving to all principles held by earnest Christian men their fullest and best expression. The policy of THE REVIEW in this country will be what it has been in England—the better understanding of one another by the various denominations, with a view to helping toward that unity for which our Master prayed, and which faces all true Christians as the splendid goal toward which the church is slowly but surely moving. If we mistake not, the sentiment in favor of some vital Christian union is quite as strong in America, where all the churches are "Free Churches," as in England, where Protestantism is divided into Established and Nonconformist churches. Confidently expecting the sympathy and co-operation of a large number of the most spiritual, and therefore the most vital Christian workers and thinkers in all the land; and believing that the search for some way in which all may co-operate as brethren in the common service to which we are called by our Master is no vain quest, this work is very humbly but gladly undertaken.

Our Associates. Our American readers may like to know something of the editors of the English edition of this Review, and, so far as we are able, we will introduce them. The Rev. Henry S. Lunn, M. D., is at present Chaplain of the Polytechnic, Regent street, London, where he has under his care hundreds of young people, over whom his influence as a spiritual leader is very great. Until recently he was a member of the Wesleyan Church of England. As the result of a recent controversy concerning missionary affairs in India, he has left that church and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church, thus continuing his relationship in the great Methodist family, but escaping from those conditions in England under which he was so restive. He was the originator and is the leader in the Re-union Conferences at Grindelwald and Lu-

cerne, a man of aggressive spirit, immense energy, and great power of organization. During the past few years he has become a prominent figure in ecclesiastical circles in England, and promises to be heard from in most of the forward movements for many years to come. He was the founder, and from the first has been the General Editor of this Review.

The representative of the Established Church at present is the Venerable Archdeacon Sinclair of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, who succeeded the Venerable Archdeacon Farrar, of Westminster. Dr. Sinclair, while a comparatively young man, is one of the strongest men of the Establishment in London. A loyal Churchman he is yet more liberal than many other clergymen in his treatment of his dissenting brethren. As a preacher, an organizer, and a man, he deservedly occupies a most distinguished position, and unless hindered by his liberality will be called to still more distinguished service in the not distant future.

The first Presbyterian on the board of editors was the accomplished and versatile Rev. Donald Fraser, D.D., of the Marylebone Presbyterian Church. He continued to serve as editor until his lamented death, when, after a short interim, he was succeeded by the Rev. J. Reid Howatt, an honored and promising pastor of London. It is enough commendation for his work to say that he is proving a worthy successor to Dr. Fraser.

The Congregational editor is the Rev. Alexander Mackennal, D.D., of Bowdon, near Manchester. Although pastor of a suburban rather than of a metropolitan church Dr. Mackennal is, with the possible exception of Dr. Dale, who is now able to do but little general work, the most prominent Congregational leader in England. Others are more eminent in other lines, but as a denominational leader Dr. Mackennal has now probably more influence than any other man. When Dr. Hannay resigned he was unanimously elected his successor as Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. He was Chairman of the Union in 1887, Secretary of the International Council of Congregationalists in 1891, and Secretary of the first Congress of Free Churches in 1892. No man is better fitted than Dr. Mackennal in ability, culture, and spiritual power, to represent the denomination which, next to the Establishment, is the most influential in England.

The Rev. John Clifford, D.D., the Baptist on the board of editors, is one of the most aggressive, versatile, hard-working, and successful ministers in London. He is pastor of a huge church (the Westbourne Park Baptist), which is the center of a great variety of institutional work; and in addition he is an accomplished scholar, a recognized leader in social reforms, and alto-

gether one of the most positive spiritual forces in London. John Clifford divides, with Dr. McLaren, of Manchester, the honor of the primacy among the Baptist churches of England.

Of the representative of the Wesleyans it is enough to say that the genial and cultured editor of *The Contemporary Review*, Mr. P. W. Bunting, M. A., is able somehow to find time to write most delightfully of the progress of the great Wesleyan Church of England and the various Methodist churches of the world. Mr. Bunting is the only layman on the list of editors, and even he, if we mistake not, often preaches with his voice—as he surely does with his pen, and that most effectively.

From this brief sketch it will be seen that the English editors of this Review are all eminent and honored men, whose right to speak for the denominations of which they are members no one will dispute. It is doubtful if any religious publication in Great Britain, or in the world, has on its force of working editors so large a number of representative and distinguished ministers as this Review which is now presented to the American public. It is quite unnecessary to add that all these editors are enthusiasts in the cause of Reunion, although no doubt there is among them great diversity of opinion as to how best to secure the desired result.

Foreign Missions and the Congregationalists. Perhaps the most important ecclesiastical event which has occurred in our country during the month of October has been the meeting of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, which met in Worcester, Mass., on the 10th inst. This is the oldest Foreign Missionary Society in America. When it was founded, and for many years afterward, it was a union society, the Presbyterian and Dutch Reformed denominations uniting with the Congregational in the effort to carry the Gospel to the heathen. In 1870 the New School Presbyterians, the last of co-operating denominations, withdrew in order to consummate Presbyterian union, and the Board was thus left entirely in the hands of the Congregationalists. For many years the President of the Society was the venerable and universally honored Mark Hopkins, of Williams College. After his death the Rev. Richard S. Storrs, D.D., of Brooklyn, succeeded to the Presidency. About a decade ago, a controversy arose concerning the appointment as missionaries of candidates who were not firmly convinced that those who had never had an opportunity of accepting Christ in this life would have no opportunity after death. The genesis of this controversy has never been written, but it is believed by many persons to have had its origin in personal feeling rather than in loyalty to truth. After it was given

prominence, and men were compelled to take sides, the causes which started the controversy gradually disappeared, and the personal elements no doubt gave place to genuine convictions. As a consequence this venerable missionary organization has been sadly disturbed for many years. Its meetings, which had formerly been the most inspiring of spiritual assemblies, became ecclesiastical debating societies, and those who should have cooperated were sharply antagonistic. During all this difficult period the Society has been fortunate in having as its President one who commanded the respect of the constituency of the Board, and who resolutely refused to be the representative of any party. The two "wings" may be said in a general way to have been led by the Home Secretary, Dr. E. K. Alden, and by the Professors in Andover Theological Seminary; the former insisting that none should be sent as missionaries who believed that there was opportunity for any to accept Christ after this life, and the latter believing that no man would be lost without having first refused the highest motive to repentance, viz.: the love of God as manifested in Jesus Christ, and that those who have not had such opportunity in this life will have it beyond the grave. In all the years of this controversy the work of Foreign Missions has steadily advanced because those who differed from the management have loved the cause and not withdrawn support.

The meeting of the Board at Worcester marks a new era in its history. The difficulties seem to have been buried, and a general spirit of hopefulness and confidence to prevail. The Rev. W. H. Noyes, a liberal, who for several years has been working in Japan as an independent missionary, at the unanimous request of the Japan Mission, by the decisive vote of 106 to 24, was ordered to be commissioned by the Prudential Committee. The noticeable feature about this vote is that it is in no sense partisan, for distinguished representatives of both parties recommended the appointment and voted for the resolution. The next step forward was the adoption of a plan for bringing the Board into closer relations with the churches. Hitherto it has been a close corporation. It was voted that the corporate members be increased from 250 to 350, and that most of the new members be nominated by the State Associations. Then the Prudential Committee was enlarged to fifteen, and no member may serve more than three terms of three years each without an interim of one year. That provides for the constant infusion of new blood. The next step was the declination of Dr. Alden, the Home Secretary, for renomination to that office, and of the venerable Rev. Dr. A. C. Thompson and Mr. Elbridge Torrey to serve longer on the Prudential Committee. The Rev. Charles H. Daniels, D.D., was elected in the place of Dr.

Alden, and the Rev. Dr. E. B. Webb takes the Rev. Dr. Thompson's place as Chairman of the Prudential Committee. The new members of the Committee are pledged to no policy, but it is confidently expected that they will judge all candidates in the totality of their manhood rather than by their acceptance or rejection of any one theory. The Board is greatly to be congratulated on having secured the consent of the President, the Rev. Dr. Storrs, and the Vice President, Mr. E. W. Blatchford, to continue longer in its service. Unless all signs fail this ancient and honored society has now entered on a new era of prosperity and usefulness. The work in which it is engaged was never more pressing and imperative, and the loyalty of the churches never more genuine and enthusiastic.

Bishop Coxe on Organic Union. Among the various Congresses which have been held in Chicago in connection with the Exposition none have been of more vital importance than that of the Evangelical Alliance. From the addresses delivered before that body we select that of Bishop Arthur Cleveland Coxe, of Western New York, as especially worthy of consideration, because it states so clearly the conviction of Episcopalians that the organic unity of Christendom is desirable, but that it must come along the lines of the Chicago-Lambeth declaration. We especially commend what he says concerning "The Historic Episcopate," which is the only one of the famous propositions which has caused serious difference of opinion. The epitome of Bishop Coxe's address which we present is from the report in *The Churchman* of October 21, 1893. His special subject was "Organic Union." His remarkable paper was understood and appreciated as it could not have been even two decades ago. The Bishop spoke substantially as follows: The one cry of Christian men is for organic union, a catholic church; and the man who suggests that the divisions of Christendom are pleasing to God, and its rivalries beneficial to His kingdom, finds no place in its councils. American Protestantism grew from its dream of union of sentiment into a craving for a visible union; it was forced to this by the pressure of forces antagonizing all religion. It is a basic theorem of the religious gatherings of to-day that a divided Christianity will never conquer the world, and that a united Church, and a united Church alone, works in harmony with the complete will of Him who maintained this visible unity of His Church as a necessary witness of His truth to an unbelieving world. The religious world, educated so far, comes to a point where it seeks to reunite a divided Protestantism, but has no idea beyond. All the interest and sympathy created by the proposals of the Chicago-Lambeth platform among other brethren, was made inop-

erative by their astonishment that the Historic Episcopate should be held in so vital a position. Seven years have passed since the first inspiration given by these resolutions in this month in this city, and in this Parliament of Religions the passion for Christian reunion finds expression as never before. One step forward was made; for never again, after the participation of the Roman and Greek Churches in this gathering will the union sought be merely a union of Protestant sects—the word has gone out that a reunion of Christendom is the ultimate aim of the Christian unity movement, and that no success which does not include the Greek and Roman communions will be accepted as final. The central point of the address of Bishop Coxe, which fell on soil so prepared for its fruition, was just this: The Episcopal Church holds to its insistence upon the Historic Episcopate for just this reason—its prophetic foresight was caused from its connection with historic Christianity, and it looks to reuniting the maternal Churches of the East with Western Christianity. "Unity," said the Bishop, "admits of no divisions, but is of the divine nature, the unity of the Godhead. It requires a visible unity. Among men such unity is inconceivable, impossible; but it has been and can be the result of the Spirit's working—Christ's power will be sufficient if the willing mind is found. In order to attain this unity Christians must strive to regain a unity once existing, and made by Christ a condition precedent to the world's conversion, to maintain that the unity which even the Nicene Council called 'The Ancient Customs,' is Scriptural unity, and practically attainable; that as it is the only Scriptural unity which has ever existed among vast bodies effectual for the conversion of the heathen, so it is the only catholic system, and hence the only means of reforming the Latin churches. It is a prime necessity for restoring the maternal Churches of the East. The union of Rome with the Eastern Churches is never to be accomplished until Christians of the Protestant reformation unite. All this is implied in the Lambeth proposals, and the Historic Episcopate as a seminal principle has only been objected to because the world-wide scope of the unity of the movement for unity has been heretofore unrecognized. In dealing with ancient churches fraternal love should accept such ancient constitutional principles as they regard as essential." We must be willing to give up (with due submission to Catholic rule) our theological systems. We must insist upon no "Prayer Book articles or other checks on individualism, which have never been imposed on the laity. "Who will speak of sacrifices?" each should say, "I am now ready to be offered if only the unity of the Church of Christ can be restored."

Dr. Philip Schaff. During the past month one of the most eminent scholars in America, and, in his special department, in the world, has passed away. Dr. Philip Schaff may very truly be called an American, for most of his life was spent in this country. He was born in Switzerland on the 1st of January, 1819, and came to this country in 1843. From that time until his death he was interested in all that concerned the Kingdom of God, first in our own country, and then throughout the world. About a year ago he had a stroke of paralysis, from which he partially recovered. Much against the wishes of his friends he went to the Parliament of Religions to deliver an address on "The Reunion of Christendom." Ten days after his return from Chicago he had an attack of heart disease, and the day following another stroke of paralysis, and on the 20th of October he died. Dr. Schaff was one of the most eminent and versatile scholars. His specialty was church history, but he was also eminent as an egegete. He was Chairman of the American Committee for the Revision of the Bible; he had lectured at Mercersburg, at Hartford, at Andover, and for twenty years had been associated with Union Seminary. He was Secretary of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance at the time of the meeting in New York in 1873. He was a voluminous author, and his contributions to church history are easily the most prominent which have ever been published in America. He succeeded Dr. Roswell D. Hitchcock as Professor of Church History in Union Seminary. In theology he was a liberal, and in hearty sympathy with Professor Briggs, and in all his life a most earnest and consecrated Christian man. The American Churches, in common with all Christendom, will always remember Dr. Philip Schaff with devout gratitude. He has filled a large place, done a great work, and left behind him enduring monuments to his character and ability.

Heresy in the Presbyterian Church. The end of the Briggs case, so far as it is an ecclesiastical question, has probably been reached by the action of the Synod of New York in dismissing the appeal which was made to it concerning the legality of the action of the General Assembly in Washington. We do not see that anything further can be done, so far as Professor Briggs is concerned. Of course those who sympathize with him, and would feel that their liberty had been curtailed by the action against him, will probably continue to agitate in the various Presbyteries. What the ultimate result will be it is impossible to predict. The form of the controversy, however, is now changed; henceforward it will not be the case of Professor Briggs, but of the Liberals versus the Conservatives.

The second stage in the case of Professor Henry P. Smith, late of Lane Seminary, has also been reached, and with the same result. Professor Smith appealed to the Synod of Ohio against the action of his Presbytery, which condemned him. The case was heard at length, and by a very large majority on all the counts decided against him. The most interesting event which occurred in the course of the meetings was when Dr. McKibben, the prosecutor, turned to Professor Smith and assured him that if he would promise to cease to teach views in conflict with the interpretation of Presbyterian doctrine given by the General Assembly, the Presbyterians of Cincinnati would vote to remove his suspension. He put the question directly to him as to whether he would so consent. Dr. Smith replied very wisely and carefully that he could not answer that question affirmatively without putting himself on a different plane from all other Presbyterian ministers; he would then be bound by his pledge rather than by the rules of the church. Moreover, those who were trying him would be influenced by his promise, if he were to make it, rather than by the merits of the case. Therefore he must decline. Probably this case will also go to the General Assembly. If it does, it will no doubt meet the same fate as that of Professor Briggs. Henceforward the controversy in the church will be between the parties rather than in behalf of men.

Cardinal Gibbons Christians of all denominations have united during the past month in expressions of sincere affection and honor for Cardinal Gibbons, who has just celebrated the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of his elevation to the Episcopacy. It is no exaggeration to say that no prelate in the Roman Church of the United States possesses anything like the same appreciation among Protestants as Cardinal Gibbons. Archbishop Ireland is more aggressive and a far greater orator, and doubtless others are greater administrators, but the personal element in Cardinal Gibbons—his lofty character, the fact that he is a genuine and loyal American, and his sympathy with a truly catholic type of Christianity have given him a large place in the hearts of the American people. The celebration of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary was participated in by almost every well-known Roman Catholic prelate in the country. One sermon was preached by Archbishop Corrigan, of New York, and another by Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul. The coming together of these leaders of opposing parties in friendly participation in the services in honor of Cardinal Gibbons is regarded by many as a public announcement of the settlement of the difficulties which have so sorely distracted the church. The Cardinal is an American by birth, although he

has travelled much and studied in many lands. His first Episcopal position was Bishop of Adramyttum and Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina; after that he became Bishop of Richmond, and then was called to the See of Baltimore. He was made Archbishop in 1877, and Cardinal in 1884. The exercises at this Anniversary were of great beauty and solemnity. It is gratifying to us to be able to join with so many others at this time in acknowledging the debt of American Christianity and American institutions to the liberal and spiritual Cardinal-Archbishop of Baltimore.

THE TEACHING OF OUR LORD AS TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.¹

BY THE RIGHT REV. C. J. ELLICOTT, D.D.,
BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

From *The Expository Times* (Edinburgh).

VI.

THE LORD'S TEACHING AS TO THE LAW. I.

We now proceed with the details of the appeal to Christ in reference to the Old Testament. This appeal, we have seen in the foregoing address that we are fully entitled to make; and we have further seen that the fulness of divine knowledge, which we must ascribe to our Lord and to His teaching, indisputably warrants our accepting as conclusive and final the answers to that appeal, whenever they can be shown to be either included in, or legitimately deducible from, the recorded teaching of our Lord.

But first of all, What exactly is the tenor of our appeal? Is it not substantially this?—for guidance in our estimate of the view of the Old Testament that is now pressed upon us by modern teachers, and has been set before us, both in its full and in its modified form in a foregoing paper.

Such is the tenor of the appeal. Now in what form can the answer be given? Can it be otherwise than by the utterances of Christ in regard of the Old Testament, and the deductions that may legitimately be drawn from them? If this be so, then it will at once be seen that the utmost care must be taken in selecting out of the numerous references of Christ to the Old Testament only those that bear directly, or by just and clear inference, on the subject-matter of the appeal. It cannot be too strongly urged that when we appeal to the words of Christ as authenticating the Old Testament, we must make it clear to demonstration what it is that they really do authenticate.

¹ The Christian Literature Company have a few sets of the five numbers of *Christian Literature*, containing the preceding instalments of this series, which can be supplied at \$1.25, net, per set, post paid.

The loose and popular way in which the appeal to Christ's words has often been made has greatly impaired, in many cases, the validity of the argument, and has raised prejudices against the whole nature of the appeal, from which, as we have partly seen in the preceding address, even writers of high character have not been able to free themselves. The *ad captandum* argument, bad always, is pre-eminently bad and reprehensible in momentous controversies like the present.

We shall have, then, to exercise the greatest care in our selection of the references of our Lord to the Old Testament, and especially to be on our guard against pressing them beyond what they will logically and exegetically bear. The references of our Lord which bear directly on our present controversy are confessedly few; but the references to the Old Testament, and the citations which He vouchsafed to make from it, are very numerous, and these references and citations do indisputably create impressions which are of great subsidiary moment, and often carry conviction where more direct arguments may seem to fail. A few of these impressions, derived simply from a general review of these citations and references taken as a whole, it may here not be inappropriate to specify. They are but impressions, but they are impressions which many of us will recognize as having exercised considerable influence on our estimate of the real nature and trustworthiness of the Old Testament. Of these general impressions we may mention three or four that seem to bear most upon present controversies.

The first relates to the form of the written Word, and is this—that the Old Testament to which our Lord referred was practically identical with that which we have now in use. There are, as we well know, many instances in which the exact words as quoted by our Lord are not found in any text. It may even be true, as asserted by a very competent writer, that the text of the Hebrew Scriptures in current use in our Lord's days was not the same in all respects as that which we now have; still the deviations when analysed are of a nature that certainly does not invalidate the general truth of the impression. We may be thankful that the text which we have is as pure as it seems to be. That much, however, remains to be done in this particular department may be perfectly admitted.

A second impression certainly is—that our Lord's knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, speaking humanly, was of the most exact and comprehensive nature. This impression is created not only by the numerous citations or references, extending as they do from Genesis to the Second Book of Chronicles, but also by the reminiscences, so to speak, of the Old Testament which our Master's words seem constantly

to be bringing home to us. And it is worthy of note that they are reminiscences solely of the canonical Scriptures. Not only is there no citation directly made from the Apocrypha, but, as seems most probable, not even a reference to it, or an echo from its words.¹

A third impression relates to the general aspect in which our Lord regarded the Scriptures which He cited or alluded to. That He regarded them as pre-eminently Holy Scripture, cannot possibly be doubted. This is shown indirectly by forms of reference or citation: "The Scripture,"² "The Scriptures;"³ "The law and the prophets,"⁴ in reference to the whole of the Old Testament; "The law,"⁵ in similar inclusive reference; "The Scriptures of the prophets,"⁶ and, on one occasion, somewhat significantly, "all the things that have been written *through* the prophets;"⁷ and lastly, the solemn "It is written,"⁸—these all being known forms of referring to Holy Scripture in the time of our Lord, and certainly implying that as they were regarded by our Lord's contemporaries, so were they regarded by Him.

We may mention yet a last impression which seems produced by a very large number of passages, viz., that there was a divine fulness in whatever was cited or referred to,—something far beyond the letter, depths of meaning really to be found even in what might seem the simplest forms of expression: in a word,—that the Scriptures of the Old Testament were really God's Holy Word, and were so accounted by Him, Who referred to them. The Lord's reference to the words "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,"⁹ as having been spoken by God, will occur almost at once as an illustration that perhaps more than any other, has tended to deepen the impression I am now alluding to.

These are simply a few general impressions. Yet if we paused here and went no further in our appeal to our Lord on the nature of the Old Testament, would it be easy to resist the conviction that a view of Holy Scripture such as we have considered in the analytical view could never be in harmony with these impressions? Books, some of them written at a late date for the advancement of the claims and interests of a special class, dramatised compositions, fictitious or rewritten histories—how little could they deserve to be spoken of in the terms or regarded under the aspects in which, and under which, they were spoken of and regarded by the great Teacher. What a conviction just these few impressions seem to bring home to us that He Who came to bear

¹ See Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*, vol. i. p. 35 (Edin. 1889).

² John vii. 38, comp. ver. 42; x. 55.

³ John v. 39.

⁴ Luke xvi. 16, comp. Matt. xxii. 40, and conversely Matt. xi. 13.

⁵ John x. 34.

⁶ Matt. xxvi. 56.

⁷ Luke xviii. 31.

⁸ Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10, *al.*

⁹ Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 26.

witness to the truth¹ could never have borne such a witness as that which is implied in what has been already said, if the writings of the Old Testament really were what they are represented to be by modern analysis!

But impressions are but impressions,—though I know not whether in subjects like the present they may not exercise an influence more truly to be depended on than many a formulated argument. At any rate they have their value, and may deserve to be considered as manifestations of a kind of spiritual instinct that cannot wholly be ignored. Still our appeal to Christ must go much further than this; we must leave impressions and pass onward to those definite statements and inference-bearing utterances which are readily to be found amid the very numerous references of our Lord to the Old Testament.

1. Let us take then, first, that cardinal statement in which, at the very beginning of His ministry, and under circumstances of much solemnity, our Lord distinctly specified His own relation to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and especially to the law, whether in its more restricted or its more exclusive reference. This relation was stated both negatively and affirmatively, in short and precise terms, and corroborated by a further statement marked by a similar directness and precision. The words of our Lord to which we are now referring, as we probably well remember, are from the Sermon on the Mount. They immediately follow the Beatitudes and the short opening address to the disciples, and form in effect the text for the earlier portion of the Sermon. The words are these: "Think not that I come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you,"—observe how attention is solemnly called to what follows,—"Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished."²

Words could not be stronger. They were addressed primarily to the disciples, but, as is afterwards clearly indicated,³ to many of the thronging multitude besides. The intention of the words was to prepare for a right understanding of the illustrations which followed; and, it may be, also, to check vague hopes of covenant-changes which old prophecy might seem to justify,⁴ and which actually were imputed to St. Stephen a very few years afterwards.⁵ Hence the distinctness and precision of the Lord's declaration. There can indeed hardly be any doubt as to the exact meaning. The only questions that can possibly be raised are in reference to the sense in which the

term "the law" is to be understood, and to the nature of the Lord's fulfilment of it. That "the law" cannot be restricted to what is now termed the moral law, as contrasted with the priestly or ceremonial law, seems certain, even though the illustrations are from the moral law, as such a restricted use would be contrary to the use of the word in all similar passages in the New Testament. It can only mean the whole Mosaic law,—the books of the law, as every Jew of the days of our Lord would have understood this term to include and signify. Nor can there be much doubt as to the sense in which Christ speaks of Himself as come to fulfil the law. He fulfilled the law when, whether by word or deed, He set forth its innermost meaning and contents,—all in fact that was designed by God when the law was declared,—or the ceremonies, in obedience to His divine word, enjoined upon the covenant-people. Precepts, enactments, ceremonies, types, and symbolical details, all were to have their essential meaning and purpose brought out by the great Teacher, and to receive their completion and consummation in Him. And from this law thus comprehensive and diversified no jot or tittle was to pass away, until all things should be accomplished, and this present age should melt into the age that is to come.

What a revelation; how suggestive and how full of teaching in reference to questions that are now exercising our thoughts. If Moses, the man of God, in obedience to the commandment of God, set forth the law in the varied forms in which it has come down to us, in the books which are associated with his name, such a revelation as that which we are now considering becomes conceivable. We can understand that even the ceremonial, as involving the typical, is to lose no jot or tittle of its spiritual reality until this dispensation pass utterly away. Its very typical connection with Christ clothes it with what might be termed a provisional perpetuity, an endurance till all things be accomplished. God has spoken, and His word, even in what might be considered as by its very nature only for a time and a season, endures as to its essential and absolute elements. All this we can understand and realize; but it is on the tacit assumption that those constantly recurring words in the books of the Law, "And the Lord said unto Moses," are not to be reduced to a mere liturgical formula, but to be accepted as meaning what they say. Deny this, however, directly or inferentially,—imagine the writer of the Exile using the convenient form of words to introduce what he might have thought Moses would have said if the circumstances had ever come before him; in a word, adopt the current theory of the Priestly Code, as it has been set forth in a preceding address, and we find ourselves far in the realm of the unthinkable. That

¹ John xviii. 37.

² Matt. v. 17, 18; comp. Luke xvi. 17.

³ 1b. vii. 28.

⁴ See Jer. xxxi. 31.

⁵ Acts vi. 11, 14.

the "idealisations" of the pious Jew of the Exile should be so spoken of by Him, "through Whom came grace and truth,"¹ must seem, at any rate to all plain believers in God's Holy Word, as beyond the possibilities of our conception. For it to be possible to entertain such a conception, we must first conceive the idealiser to have been inspired to write as he did write; but an inspiration that can be compatible with continually attributing to God utterances and enactments alleged to have been made to Moses, when they were due only to an interested writer, who was making use of the great Lawgiver's name, is an inspiration that is outside all reasonable and reverent consideration.

We contend, then, that the assumptions involved in the Analytical view relating to the origin of the Priestly Code are not consistent with the solemn declarations of our Lord in reference to the Mosaic law, which we have just been considering. If the Analytical view is to be maintained, much more than the jot and tittle will have to be surrendered to the ever-increasing demands of modern analysis.

WAS THERE A GOLDEN CALF AT DAN?

(*A Note on 1 Kings xii. 29, 30, and Other Passages.*)

BY VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.

From *The Expositor* (London), October, 1893.

The question asked at the head of this note will, to many readers, sound quite absurd. They will say, "Of course there was 'a calf' at Dan, and another at Bethel, as is stated in 1 Kings xii. 29, although there is some obvious obscurity or corruption in verse 30." Besides, that there were two calves—one at Dan and one at Bethel, has been a received tradition for at least 2,500 years; to doubt it shows the utmost temerity.

Certainly the statement has been made from early days without dispute down to the time of the latest Rabbis; and that might be considered sufficient proof. But against this argument must be set the fact that the Book of Kings was not written earlier than B. C. 542, and that Samaria fell B. C. 722; and that even if the text of 1 Kings xii. 29 be uncorrupted from the original, there would be time in two centuries of anarchy for some confusion on the subject to arise, especially as Dan lay on the remote northern frontier, and had been the seat of an idolatrous worship since the early days of the Judges, and was destroyed by Tiglath Pileser as early as B. C. 738.

In writing the volume on the First Book of Kings for the *Expositor's Bible* I felt a doubt on the subject, which was not, however, sufficiently strong to make me abandon the traditional view. But in reading 1 Kings xii as the Sunday Lesson

¹ John i. 17.

for the Tenth Sunday after Trinity the doubt returned to my mind, and I think that there are some grounds for the view that *there were two calves at Bethel, and that there was no calf at Dan, but only the old idolatrous ephod and images of Micah* described in Judges xvii. 4.

I will return to 1 Kings xii. 29 immediately, but will first of all examine the question independently of it.

Thirty-three or more years ago, in the article, "Calf," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, I gave some of the decisive arguments which prove that though the epithet "calf" is given in scorn to the figure made by Aaron in the wilderness, and "calves" to those erected by Jeroboam I., the figures were by no means intended for mere calves, but were nothing less than cherubic emblems of exactly the same character as those sanctioned by Aaron, by Moses in the Tabernacle, and by Solomon in the Temple.¹

On this subject it is sufficient to notice the following facts:—

(i.) Jeroboam's calves neither did, nor were intended to, interfere with the worship of Jehovah.

(a) The prophets of Northern Israel always regarded themselves as prophets of Jehovah. Apostate kings, like Ahab, allowed alien cults to be introduced side by side with the worship of Jehovah, though, strange to say, to a far less extent in the northern than in the southern kingdom. Yet the worst of them all never persecuted, never suppressed, and never repudiated the worship of Jehovah.²

(b) The name of Jehovah, after the days of Ahab, grew so extraordinarily common that, not only did Ahab name his sons from compounds of Yah, but every subsequent king of Israel, except the murderers Shallum, Menahem, and Pekah, had that element in their names.

(γ) Not one of the genuine prophets of Israel is recorded to have uttered one syllable of reprobation of the "calf worship" before Amos and Hoshea, and it is doubtful whether Amos did so. Although the word of Elijah "burned like a torch"; although Elisha lived in intimacy with several kings of Israel; although Micaiah, son of Imlah, did not fear the face of Ahab; although Jonah, son of Amitai, prophesied the greatness of Jeroboam II., none of these prophets is recorded to have uttered a word of remonstrance against the irregular cherubic *cultus* which prevailed in the kingdom of Samaria from the beginning of the reign of Jeroboam I., B. C. 937, to the end of the reign of Hoshea, B. C. 722. Nor except in the late speech put by the Chronicler into the mouth of Abijah, son of Rehoboam, many

¹ Exod. xxv. 18; 1 Kings vi. 23.

² Ahab did not do so personally, though he connived at the violences of Jezebel.

centuries later, is there any reprobation of the northern worship in any southern prophet, or in any king before Josiah. The Chronicler—a fact, I think, that has never been noticed, vehemently orthodox as he was for the Deuteronomic law of centralised worship—scarcely does more than mention the “*calves*”; ¹ his indignation is mainly against the irregular altars of the irregular *hamoth*, and the non-Levitic priests whom Jeroboam established, although he incidentally mentions that these priests served the calves and the *he-goats* (A.V., devils).² Nay, more, even the man of God from Judah, who travels to Bethel to denounce the new king of Israel, prophesies against the *altar*, but does not so much as mention the calves at all. Even as regards Hosea, it is not certain that when he speaks of the “*calf*” he is not rather alluding to Baal worship. The Book of Tobit—which, of course, is a Jewish *Haggadah*, without the least authority, goes so far as (unjustly and falsely) to describe the imaginary calf at Dan as *ἡ δάμαλις βαᾶλ*. This, too, is perhaps implied by the feminine used by the LXX. [*τὴν μίαν*], which might also be a reference to Bosheth, “shame,” the word often read instead of Baal.

But if the “*calves*” were cherubic emblems which were regarded as intolerably wicked by the historians who wrote respectively four centuries and five centuries after Jeroboam, but respecting which the conscience of the kings, and even of the earlier splendid prophets of Israel, seem to have felt no self-reproach, is it not extremely probable that there were *two calves* at Bethel, and not one? Jeroboam’s avowed purpose was to provide his people with a substitute for the attractions of Solomon’s Temple at Jerusalem. But the central object of reverence in the Temple on Mount Zion was the Ark and its mercy-seat overshadowed by the two small ancient cherubim of Moses (if they were still preserved, for we have nothing explicit on this point)³ and by the two colossal cherubim of Solomon. Jehovah was symbolized to the people as

“Thundering out of Zion, throned
Between the cherubim.”

These cherubim haunted the imagination of prophets and psalmists.⁴ What were they? It is usually assumed that they were winged *human* figures, but there is very much to be said for the belief, which is by no means a modern one, that they were winged oxen. Not to dwell upon the

¹ Only in 2 Chron. xi. 15, xiii. 8. In neither place is Dan mentioned.
² 2 Chron. xiii. 8. Heb. (*שִׁרְמָם*) “he-goats,” i.e. satyrs (Luther, *Feldtaifel*).

³ The word commonly used for Aaron’s calf and Jeroboam’s is *בָּשָׂר*, which properly means *μόσχος*, “a young bull.” The feminine word *בָּשָׂרָה* is used in Hos. x. 5.

⁴ See Ezek. x. 2, 5, 16, 29; Exod. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89; 1 Sam. iv. 4 Isa. xxxvii. 18; Ps. lxxx. 1, xcix. 1, etc.

uncertain derivation of the word *cherub*,¹ it is extremely doubtful whether either Moses or Solomon would have tolerated the introduction of winged *human* figures. That Solomon tolerated carved oxen we know, and when Josephus charges him with violation of the law for so doing, the whole tendency of Jewish history shows that he is transferring the sentiments of A. D. 50 back to B. C. 1000. The composite fourfold cherub of Ezekiel was almost certainly a much later emblem; but even in that emblem it is a very remarkable circumstance that in Ezek. x. 14 “*the face of a cherub*” is the equivalent “*to the face of an ox*” in the parallel passage, Ezek. i. 10. Further, the cherubs over the mercy-seat are described as looking down into the mercy-seat, and yet looking toward each other. Without making too much of this description, it certainly seems to accord much better with winged oxen than with winged men (Exod. xxv. 20). When Josephus says that no one could tell or even conjecture the real shape of the cherubim, he is probably concealing the fact that they were winged oxen, which would have confirmed the jibes of the Gentiles against the Jews as to their supposed animal worship.²

Granting, then, that the calves of Jeroboam were identical with the two-winged cherubs which Solomon placed in the Holiest at Jerusalem, is it not much more probable that Jeroboam placed *two* of these symbols at Bethel than that he placed one? Would not one cherubic figure have been regarded as a very maimed and unattractive counterpoise to the two in the oracle?

Further, I may claim for this view the authority of the prophet Hosea, who speaks of “*the calves of Beth-aven*” (Hos. x. 3.) It is no answer to this that he says, “*Thy calf, O Samaria, hath cast thee off*”; or, as it should be rendered, “*Thou hast cast off thy calf, O Samaria*,” because there, obviously, the word “*calf*” is only generic.

If then there were two calves in what the priest Amaziah calls “*the king’s chapel*” at Bethel, this fact and the constant reference to them as two in number—would naturally help to stereotype the notion that one of them was at Dan and one at Bethel when once it had arisen; especially since there was *also* a highly irregular cult at Dan, and the growth of centuries tended to obliterate the distinctness of facts which were only preserved for long centuries by dim tradition.

For to the calf at Dan, during all the process of the history of the northern and southern kingdoms, we have not a single allusion, unless there be one in Amos viii. 14, to which I will refer later on. To trace so much as the existence of a “*calf*” at Dan we have to come down from its in-

¹ Perhaps from *בָּשָׂר*, “he ploughed.”

² Jos., *Antiq.*, viii. 3, § 3.

auguration, B.C. 937, to the Book of Tobit, perhaps A.D. 70.¹

It has indeed been customary to say (and I repeat it in the article "Calf," in Smith's Dictionary) that the calf at Dan was carried away by Tiglath Pileser III. (Pul) about B.C. 738; and the calf at Bethel by Sargon (about B.C. 722.) But what is the authority for this statement? The *Seder Olam Rabba*, a Rabbinic book of no authority on such a subject!² And when we come to think of it, the total absence of all mention of this supreme relic—one of the two chief "gods" of the conquered nation—in the records of Tiglath Pileser III., or in any other Assyrian records, or in any Jewish writer, makes the guess of the Talmudists extremely improbable. As to the golden calf or calves at Bethel we read in Hosea that they shall be dashed to splinters, and be taken as a bribe or present to King Combat, but this may not be meant for a literal prediction.³

Further, it is *a priori* improbable that Jeroboam would think of erecting a golden calf at Dan;—and that for two good reasons.

(i.) The place was indeed nominally in his dominions, but it was on the remote border, and not at all on the road to Jerusalem as Bethel was. It was a town which entered so little into the ordinary stream of Israelitish life that it is only mentioned once in all the history, and only twice in all the prophets.⁴

And (ii.) there was an overpoweringly strong reason why Jeroboam should not take this step. There was an ancient and venerable sanctuary and *bamah* at Dan already; and there was an ancient venerable molten or plated image there known as Micah's "ephod";⁵ and there was an hereditary line of priests who traced their ancestry direct to Jonathan, the grandson of Moses.⁶ In the story of that wandering Levite—the degenerate grandson of the mighty lawgiver who was content to serve a private idol for a few pounds a year—we are expressly told that priests of his family continued to be in charge of this cult "to the days of the captivity of the land."⁷ Ewald indeed conjectures that the reading should be "till the days of the captivity of the ark" (reading *תְּנַשֵּׁא* for *תְּנַשֵּׁעַ*), which

¹ So Hitzig. But even the passage in Tobit does not mention Dan, it only says that Nephtali sacrificed "to the she-heifer Baal." It is only in the *Itala* that we find Dan mentioned. And even here Grätz and Neubauer conjecture that the right reading is *Bethel*.

² The Rabbis had many monstrous *Haggadot* about the calves:—e.g. that they were suspended by magnets; that they spoke, etc. (*Sanhedrin*, 1. 107, 2); that the foundation of Rome began the day they were erected (*Shabbath*, 1. 56, 2), and so forth.

³ Hos. viii. 5, x. 5, 6. See Wellhausen *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 118. ⁴ Amos viii. 14. In Jer. iv. 15, viii. 16 it is only mentioned as a northern frontier town.

⁵ There was, indeed, a complete treasure-house of images there—"an ephod and teraphim, and a graven image and a molten image" (Judg. xviii. 14, 18). They would not want a cherub beside. Was the molten image a calf?

⁶ Judg. xviii. 30. Manasseh is a timid Jewish falsification, caused by the introduction of the single letter *n*, which was suspended above the *Q'ri*, and was only intended to mislead the uninitiated.

⁷ Judg. xviii. 30.

would bring the priesthood of the descendants of Moses to an end at the destruction of Shiloh by the Philistines in the days of Eli. But there is not a trace in any MS., or version, or Targum, of such a reading; and though I once thought it possible, it now seems to me entirely untenable. All who know the extraordinary tenacity of reverence with which Orientals cling to local sanctuaries and to local cults, will see at once that, independently of its situation, which does not seem appropriate to Jeroboam's object, the last place which seems probable for Jeroboam to have thought of as suitable for the introduction and establishment of an unauthorized image-worship was one in which an unauthorized image-worship so many centuries older was already existing under the jealous guardianship of generations of Levitic though heretical priests.

What then are we to say of the only two passages of the Bible which would militate against these conclusions?

(1) As regards Amos viii. 14 there is little to explain, for it says nothing of a golden calf at Dan. It runs in our A.V. :—

"They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy god, O Dan, liveth; and the manner of Beer-sheba liveth; even they shall fall, and never rise up again."

This is corrected in the R.V. into "As thy god, O Dan, liveth."

It is on the face of it unlikely that this refers to any golden calf at Dan. For (i.) there could in that case be no reason for passing over the far more prominent calf or calves at Bethel; (ii.) the sin of Samaria was probably some Baal-image or Asherah there, and "the way of Beersheba" also points to some unknown cult other than that of the golden calves. In all probability, therefore, the special reference is still to the old ephod—a plated image—of which the worship and the priesthood had by that time acquired an immemorial sanctity.

For, indeed, Amos does not seem to have said one word against the "calf" worship, any more than Elijah or Elisha did. All his stern denunciations are aimed at oppression, robbery and wrong; at luxury, cruelty, and greed; and in accordance with normal message of all the greatest prophets, he denounces the reliance on ritual in place of righteousness. His silence is the more remarkable because it was at Bethel that he exercised his prophetic functions. "Come to Bethel," he says, "and transgress; at Gilgal multiply your transgressions" (iv. 4); and "I will also visit the altars at Bethel" (iii. 14);¹ and "Seek not Bethel, nor enter into Gilgal, and pass not to Beer-

¹ Wellhausen (*Skizzen—Die Kleinen Propheten*, pp. 7, 77) thinks that iii. 14 breaks the connexion, and militates against the things against which Amos really spoke. But apart from this the allusion is quite indefinite.

sheba." He alludes to unauthorized worship at Bethel, but nowhere mentions the word "calf"; and when Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, complains of him for constructive treason, he reports him to Jeroboam II. for threats of doom especially against the royal house, and tells him to prophesy no more at Bethel, because "it is the king's chapel and the national temple."¹ (Amos vii. 10-13.) But he does not say that Amos had denounced the long-established form of northern worship, which in the eyes of its High Priest would have been a far more heinous crime. And, in fact, the worship at Bethel, Gilgal, Beersheba—even at Samaria itself—may have been irregular rather than idolatrous; it may have been the worship of Jehovah, but under false and dangerous forms. In any case viii. 14 is the sole mention of Dan, and there is no certainty at all that the reference is to any golden calf.

The inference is strengthened by reference to the almost contemporary, though somewhat later, prophets, Hosea, and the Zechariah who wrote Zech. ix.-xi.

1. As regards Hosea, he speaks of Gilgal and Bethel, but apparently in connexion with the worship of Jehovah (iv. 15); of Mizpah and Tabor (v. 1); of Samaria (x. 5); of Bethel again² (x. 15); and of Gilgal (xii. 11); but

(i.) he does not once mention Dan; and

(ii.) the only passages in which he distinctly refers to "calf" worship are viii. 5, 6, x. 5, xiii. 2, *the only passages in all the Prophets in which "calf" worship is mentioned at all.* And here we may note (α) that this earliest allusion to the cult of the cherubic symbols as "calves" would probably sound very blasphemous and unjust to the Israelites of the northern kingdom at first, familiar as the taunt afterwards became; ³ (β) that the use of the plural ("the calves of Bethaven," as x. 5) seems to support the belief that there were *two* there, as well as in the Holiest place of the Temple; (γ) that Hosea seems to mingle up the worship with Baal worship, and even with burnt sacrifice, which certainly did not originally belong to it (xiii. 1, 2, *Heb.*); ⁴ (δ) that viii. 5, 6, "He hath cast off thy calf, O Samaria, . . . the calf of Samaria shall be broken in pieces," may refer to some image of Baal at Samaria, not at Bethel; (ε) that when he speaks of "the black-robed ones," (the *Chemarim*, or illegal priests) of Bethaven, mourning for the "calves" of Bethaven, and adds "it (the idol) shall also be carried for a present to King Jareb," he does not say, as is sometimes assumed, that Sargon should

carry the calf or calves away captive, but rather uses the reproachful threat, "Your calf is of gold, so that you will have to send it as part of your ransom money to King Combat."

2. As for the Zechariah of Zech. ix.-xi., occupied as he is with Ephraim and her murderous later kings, he does not drop a single allusion to the calves either at Dan or at Bethel.

It only remains to examine 1 Kings xii. 28-30, where we are told that Jeroboam "made two calves of gold. . . . And he set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan. And this thing became a sin; for the people went (to worship) before the one, unto Dan"; for which the R. V. gives, in the margin, "before each of them, even to Dan."

The unexplained difficulty in verse 30 shows that there has been some early confusion of the text. Little as I am generally inclined to follow the somewhat wild conjectures of Klostermann—and I do not wholly follow him here—it seems to me, that, considering all the circumstances which I have mentioned, the text may here have originally been to the following effect. "And Jeroboam bethought himself of a plan, and went and made two golden calves in Bethel, and said to the people (LXX. πρὸς τὸν λαόν), 'Enough of going up to Jerusalem! See thy Elohim, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt, and who established the one (emblem) in Bethel, and conceded (LXX. ἐδωκε) the *ephod* in Dan. And the people went to the *ephod* at Dan (and neglected Bethel). Then made he *bamoth* in Bethel, and made priests of all the people.'

I do not, of course, say that the text stood exactly so; I only say, partially following Klostermann, that it may have been to this purport. The alteration of a single letter, reading τὸν, the "ephod," in verse 29, for τὴν "the one," accounts for the main confusion; and if "in Bethel" stood in verse 31, it may easily have got confused with *Beth bamoth* ("a house of high places, or, as the LXX. has it, οἴκοις ἐφ' ἑψηλῶν").

Every one will see at a glance how well this corresponds with the conclusion of the passage. For there (xii. 32, 33) Jeroboam makes a great feast at Bethel to the people, and, while not a syllable is said of Dan, we are told that *there* he offered upon the altar, "sacrificing unto the calves" (observe the plural) "that he had made; and he placed in Bethel the priests of the *bamoth* that he had made, and went up to the altar that he had made in Bethel." Attention is as entirely concentrated, as it is throughout the whole history, on *Bethel*: and Dan is passed over as completely as if it never existed.

Of course if this misconception, or error, was early found in the text of the Book of Kings (which was not published before B.C. 542) it

¹ Literally, "house of the kingdom."

² He, or a later editor, calls Bethel "Bethaven," "house of vanity," i.e., of idols; and Aven (x. 8).

³ Wellhausen, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 118.

⁴ The meaning may be, "Let them that sacrifice men kiss the calves."

would naturally be the case that in the shape of a single marginal gloss, it would get early established in the tradition, as in 2 Kings x. 29. The "two calves" are also mentioned in 2 Chron. xiii. 8, but in that place it is not stated that they were not both at Bethel.

Klostermann, in his very brief note on 1 Kings xii. 28-30, gives a hint of these conclusions, which seem to me not only possible but adapted to remove many difficulties. So far as I know, the matter has never been argued out before. *The alteration of one letter*, and the excision of a brief exegetical gloss in 2 Kings x. 29, gives a clearer and more consistent view of the whole history of Israel. I do not, however, pretend to do more than to invite further attention to the matter.

THE RECOVERY OF LACHISH.

BY REV. THOMAS HARRISON, SECRETARY OF THE
PALESTINE EXPLORATION FUND.

From *The Newbery House Magazine* (London), October, 1893.

Somewhere about 3,350 years ago Joshua led the men of Israel to their first triumphs west of the Jordan, in the land which God had promised to them for a possession. East of the Jordan, under the leadership of Moses, they had already established their power on the ruins of the kingdoms of Sihon and Og, whose terrible overthrow in the battles of Jahaz and Edrei would indeed have put "the dread and fear" of the conquerors upon the neighboring peoples. Two reverses, however, one military, the o'her diplomatic, marked the beginning of Joshua's exercise of the chief command. The first—an unsuccessful attack upon the city of Ai, was in consequence of the sin of Achan: the second—the treaty with the Gibeonites, was brought about by the craft of that tribe, and by the neglect of the Israelitish leaders to "ask counsel at the mouth of the Lord" (Josh. ix., 14). Both these reverses would have the effect of reassuring to some extent the various kings of western Palestine, and led—the Gibeonite treaty in particular—to the formation of that very Amorite league which almost immediately called for the attention and energy of Joshua. While the conquest of Jericho and Ai opened to Joshua the passes from the sub-tropical and enervating Jordan valley to the higher and healthier grounds of the interior, the treaty with the Gibeonites drew him into the very heart of the country. Discovering a few days after the swearing of the league that it had been obtained by fraud, Joshua made a three days' march and appeared with his army in the midst of their cities, which were Gibeon, Chephirah,

Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim. Despite the murmuring of the people, the princes of Israel held the league to be sacred, but the Gibeonites were reduced to servitude. This journey would give Joshua an opportunity of reconnoitering the country, which doubtless proved of great service when the conflict with his enemies began in real earnest. As he had left strong cities unconquered in his rear, Joshua fell back upon his permanent camp at Gilgal. Meanwhile the king of the nearest fortified city, Adonizedek of Jerusalem, alarmed alike by the fate of Jericho and Ai on the one hand, and the league with the Gibeonites on the other, succeeded in drawing four neighboring Amorite kings into an alliance which had for its object an immediate attack upon Gibeon and the making of common cause against the Israelite invaders. The allied kings were Adonizedek, King of Jerusalem; Hoham, King of Hebron; Piram, King of Jarmuth; Japhia, King of Lachish; and Debir, King of Eglon. Looking at the position of these Amorite cities on a good map it will be seen that the possession of the Gibeonite cities and the passes leading thereto from the south and west practically laid the whole of Southern Palestine, and the Amorite cities in particular, open to the attack of the Israelites. The Amorite kings saw the danger, and with their combined forces they besieged the stronghold of Gibeon which commanded the pass of Beth-Horon on the west, and stood opposite the opening of the pass of Ai on the east. The Gibeonites at once sent an urgent appeal to Joshua. Apart from the moral obligations involved in the league with them, which Joshua would be the last to disregard, that skilful general would see at once the immense advantages which would be gained by striking a blow at the Amorite confederacy upon the territory of his allies, and at a point where a victory would mean much more than the raising of the siege of Gibeon and the deliverance of its people. Joshua immediately responded to the appeal, and setting out from Gilgal he marched all night, passing Ai on his way, now held by his own garrison, and to the amazement of besiegers and besieged, appeared before Gibeon at daybreak. The battle which followed was most decisive in its character and far-reaching in its results. It was one of the great battles of the world. The limits and scope of this paper, however, forbid any description of the conflict, but the victory which the Israelites won, and the way in which Joshua followed up the dispersion of the Amorite forces by attacking their cities in quick succession, soon made him master of the whole of Southern Palestine, even to Kadesh Barnea. In this series of important victories there was none more important than the assault and capture of Lachish. While some of the neighboring cities fell on the day of attack, of

Lachish alone it is stated that it was taken on the second day. It was probably a place of great strength. Its geographical position too was of the utmost importance to Joshua, giving him command of the Plain of Philistia, which both before and after his time was the highway of the invader. At the division of the land Lachish and neighborhood fell to the lot of Judah.

An interval of about four hundred and seventy-five years elapses before Lachish reappears in Bible History, and then it is mentioned as one of the cities of Rehoboam's diminished kingdom which he fortified. One hundred and fifty years later Rehoboam's ninth successor, Amaziah, fled hither from Jerusalem, when misfortune and disgrace had come upon him, and a conspiracy threatened his life. At Lachish, however, he found no sanctuary, for here he was followed and slain (810 B.C.). A further period of one hundred and fifty years brings us to the reign of King Hezekiah, and the great siege of Lachish by the Assyrians, under Sennacherib (701 B.C.). The Bible suggests but does not distinctly state the fate of the city. The year 590 B.C. saw Nebuchadnezzar wasting the cities of Judah, and Lachish is specially mentioned along with Jerusalem and Azekah as fortified places attacked during the campaign (Jer. xxiv., 7). Nehemiah includes the city among the places reoccupied after the exile, and from that time it has no recorded history.

With the facts and dates of this brief general sketch in mind, we turn to the researches and discoveries of the last few years—the last three years in particular; and we shall find not only that the facts of the Bible narrative are strikingly illustrated and confirmed, but also the probabilities suggested by that narrative. The question as to the actual site of the ancient Lachish naturally arises in the first place. In the fourth century A.D. Eusebius and Jerome refer to Lachish as being seven Roman miles from Eleutheropolis southward on the way to Darum; but it is by no means certain that the reference is to the true site. When Dr. Robinson was exploring the country in 1838, he visited Um Lakis, together with the neighboring sites of Ajlân and Tell el Hesy. He argues against identifying Um Lakis with the ancient Lachish, but finally seems to have left the site in doubt. Of Tell el Hesy he says that "a finer position for a fortress or fortified city could hardly be imagined," but it never seems to have occurred to him as the site of Lachish. In 1875 Major Conder, while engaged in surveying the country for the Palestine Exploration Fund, directed his attention to the recovery of the lost site. The result he states as follows: "One other great city occupied our attention from the Mejdel camp, namely Lachish, a place which seems to have been still known in

the fourth century. We visited Umm Lags . . . and could not but conclude that no ancient or important city ever stood there, nor has the name any radical similarity to that of Lachish. Much nearer, indeed, would be the title El Hesy, applying to a large ancient site with springs, near the foot of the hills, about in the proper position for Lachish. The modern name means 'a water pit,' and if it is a corruption of Lachish it would afford a second instance of a change which is well known to have taken place in the case of Michmash—the K being changed to a guttural H. The distance from Beit Jibrin to Tell el Hesy is not much greater than that given by the Onomasticon for Lachish, while the proximity of Eglon (Ajlân) and the position south of Beit Jibrin, on a principal road, near the hills, and by one of the only springs in the plain, all seem to be points strongly confirming this view."

Nothing was done to verify Major Conder's identification until the Spring of 1890, when Dr. Flinders Petrie arrived in the Holy Land, as the representative of the Palestine Exploration Fund, with authority from the Turkish Government to excavate at Um Lakis and Khurbet Ajlân. These two sites were supposed to represent respectively Lachish and Eglon. Three days' work at the first-named place satisfied Dr. Petrie that the site was comparatively modern. Khurbet Ajlân afforded no better prospect, and he determined to move on to Tell el Hesy, which to his practised eye promised better results. It was, fortunately, within the area covered by the Turkish firman, and here during the first season of six weeks most interesting and valuable work went steadily on in spite of many difficulties. It may be stated at once in anticipation of the evidence given below, that the excavations of Dr. Petrie and Mr. Bliss have placed beyond doubt Major Conder's conclusion that Tell el Hesy is the ancient Lachish; thus setting at rest a matter which has probably been in uncertainty or dispute for at least 2,000 years.

The "Tell" or hill, described by Dr. Robinson as being in form like a truncated cone, is a conspicuous object both from the East and West. The base of the steep East face is washed by the stream of the Wady Hesy, which, though a torrent in Winter, would entirely fail in Summer but for an excellent spring about a furlong north of the Tell and other springs that fall into the Wady Muleihah, which joins the Wady Jizâir close to the Tell and thenceforward the stream is known as the Wady el Hesy. This great mound occupies the north-east corner of an enclosure which is about a quarter of a mile across. The highest point is 120 feet above the bed of the stream, and 340 feet above sea-level. "The summit commands a rich and pleasing prospect

over a wide extent of undulating country, low swelling hills and broad valleys." Now that the site has been recovered, it is not difficult to realize the strategic importance which Lachish had in the eyes not only of Joshua, but also of Egyptian and Assyrian kings, who at various times besieged and took it. To Joshua it meant a stronghold whence he could command at a favorable distance the great road along the coast, by which the commerce between two great empires passed in time of peace, and their armies in time of war. Moreover, the possession of Lachish gave to Joshua the key of Southern Palestine, and it is not now surprising with the map before us to read the rapid summary of conquest which follows so closely on the record of the fall of Lachish in the Book of Joshua (ch. x, 34-40).

Again, Dr. Petrie points out that "here alone are natural springs, no others existing in all the neighborhood; nor, so far as I have seen, are there any nearer than the 'upper and nether springs' of Caleb, some nineteen miles off in the Hebron mountains. In a country where deep wells, over a hundred feet in many cases, are the only constant source of water, the possession of springs is as much coveted as it was by the bride of Othniel. To hold the springs means life for the flocks and herds, and the interposing of a serious difficulty for any intruder who might try to occupy the thirsty land around. To the present time, thousands of animals are watered here daily, and there are far more Bedawin camps within easy reach of this water than in any equal patch of country." Of the remaining four cities of the Amorite league, Eglon will be found three and a half English miles to the southeast of Tell el Hesy, in the Wady Muleihah, at an ancient site now known as Tel Nejileh. Jarmuth is hidden among the hills to the northeast, nineteen miles distant. Hebron lies behind the high hills twenty-two miles eastward, while Jerusalem is thirty-three miles to the northeast. When the actual work of excavation began at the Tell, Dr. Petrie found that the *latest* remains, viz., those found in the first foot or two of earth on the top of the mound, belonged to about the middle of the fifth century B.C. These consisted of fragments of Greek pottery, which, by careful comparison with similar pottery of known date, fixed 450 B.C. as the time when the site was deserted. The East face of the Tell, which has been encroached upon in the course of ages by the stream when in flood, revealed the fact that the natural height of the hill on the top of which the first town stood was about sixty feet above the stream, and that from that point upwards for another sixty feet to the present surface of the ground, the Tell was simply *an accumulation of the ruins of one city on the top of another.* This gradual

raising of the surface of the ground in towns by the wear and tear of ages is represented in London by a rise of about one foot per century. In Egypt, where the climatic conditions and building materials are different, it is three or four feet per century. What was it at Lachish? This question Dr. Petrie has satisfactorily answered by what we may call his "pottery scale," the value of which to the practical archaeologist can hardly be overestimated. Collecting from the different strata of ruins (made accessible by the encroachment of the stream) the numerous fragments of Phœnician pottery which came to hand, it was found that the latest Phœnician pottery occurred at 320 feet above sea-level, or twenty feet from the top of the mound, while the earliest were found at a level of 295 feet, or forty-five feet from the surface. Now the date of Phœnician pottery, so far discovered elsewhere, is from 800 to 1400 B.C. Taking therefore 1100 B.C. as the middle of the Phœnician period and thirty-two and a half feet, or a level of 307½ feet as the middle of the Phœnician age at Tell el Hesy, we have 650 years as the period during which that thirty-two and a half feet accumulated, the top of the mound representing 450 B.C., as stated above. This gives five feet per century as the average rate of accumulation. Applying this to the whole of the artificial part of the Tell, Dr. Petrie gives the following table:

Top of mound	340 feet above sea	=	450 B.C.
Latest Phœnician	320	"	= 850 B.C.
Earliest	295	"	= 1350 B.C.
Earliest dwellings	278	"	= 1670 B.C.

The many sieges of the place and the greater rainfall of the region will account for the average rise of five feet per century as against the lower rate in some Egyptian sites. This brief sketch does bare justice to this wonderful "pottery scale," which detailed research has vindicated at Lachish and elsewhere. Of course there are local facts and special features in the history of an ancient site which always have to be taken into consideration; but the way in which the scale has been applied and illustrated at Lachish will be of immense advantage to all future excavators in the Holy Land.

The examination of the lowest levels of the artificial part of the Tell, viz., that which according to the scale should be dated 1350 to 1760 B.C., resulted in the discovery of numerous specimens of distinctive Amorite pottery, worked flints, and also of a massive wall of unburnt brick, running east and west along the north side of the city. This great Amorite wall was found to be twenty-eight feet eight inches thick, and after having apparently been ruined down to a height of ten or eleven feet, the inside was levelled up to it, and a still thicker wall was built on it. This in turn having been

ruined, a third wall with its outer face set back a little was founded on the part remaining; and on this part a fourth thick wall was found to the height of two or three feet. These Amorite walls were traced fifty-six feet along the north side, and were seen again by cuttings made in to them further west. In presence of these great walls it is interesting to read the report of the spies sent by Moses from the Wilderness by the way of Hebron into this very district—a report in which the Amorites are specially mentioned, and in which it is said, “nevertheless the people be strong that dwell in the land, and the cities are walled and very great.” (Num. xiii., 28.)

In the Amorite stratum Egyptian beads and scarabs of the period of the eighteenth dynasty were also discovered. The name and title of Queen Taia, a foreign princess who became the wife of Amenophis III. of Egypt (1500 B.C.), are found on one of the beads. But perhaps the most important and interesting object brought to light was a *a cuneiform tablet*, “the first record,” writes Prof. Sayce, “of pre-Israelitish Canaan, which has been yielded up by the soil of Palestine, and it is a token and earnest that more are to follow.” The tablet is about two and a half inches square, and is covered on both sides with writing in an ancient form of the cuneiform script. In size, shape, and grammatical forms, it closely resembles the tablets from other Canaanitish cities which were found in the year 1887 amid the ruins of the palace of Amenophis IV., or Khu-en-Aten, at Tel el Amarna, in Upper Egypt. The date cannot be later than 1460 B.C. In the Tel el Amarna collection there is a letter from *Zimridi, the Governor of Lachish*, to the Pharaoh of Egypt, of which the following is a translation by Prof. Sayce. It will serve as a specimen of the political correspondence of that time. “To the King, my Lord, my God, my Sun-god, the Sun-god who is from Heaven, thus (writes) Zimridi, the Governor of the city of Lachish, thy servant, the dust of thy feet, at the feet of the King, my Lord, the Sun-god from Heaven, bows himself seven times seven. I have very diligently listened to the words of the messenger whom the King, my Lord, has sent to me, and now I have dispatched (a mission) according to his message.”

Zimridi, of Lachish, is also mentioned in another letter in the same collection, from the King of Jerusalem, whose name is read by Major Conder, as Adonizedek. It is therefore of the utmost interest to find the name of Zimridi on the tablet found by Mr. Bliss in the Amorite section of Tel el Hesy, where this very Zimridi held the place for the King of Egypt before ever the Israelites had appeared in the land. The bearing of this tablet upon the identification of the site is unmistakable.

Immediately above the ruins of the Amorite city were found the remains of buildings which had been of a rough and barbaric description, the rounded water-worn stones from the bed of the stream having entered largely into their construction. Upon these rested a great bed of ashes, five feet in thickness but gradually becoming thinner as the edges of the Tell were approached. After carefully examining this ash-bed at different points, Dr. Petrie was led to the conclusion, by unmistakable indications, that the general distribution of the ashes over the Tell was due to the wind, at a time when the place was uninhabited, except by alkali burners, to whose presence and work the ash-bed is attributed. The level of the rounded stone buildings and the great bed of ashes is from 298 to 308 feet, and this level, according to the scale, points to the period from 1300 to 1100 B.C. as the date of this part of the Tell. Turning to the history of the site we find that these evidences of destruction and desolation accord well with it. We have only to turn to the Old Testament and read carefully through the period of the Judges in order to see that their time was one of lawlessness and disorder, of savage conflicts and desperate encounters, of sudden raids and violent commotions; when, to use the significant words with which the Book of Judges closes, “every man did that which was right in his own eyes.” It was the age which witnessed the destruction of the Amorite civilization by the tribes of Israel, fresh from the life of the desert, and it was not till the reigns of David and Solomon (1050 to 975 B.C.) that their civilization in all matters relating to art at least, equalled that which their forefathers had displaced. There is no mistaking the impressive testimony of the Tell. In the level, immediately above the great ash-bed, the remains of a large building were uncovered near the north wall of the Tell. The walls were about five feet six inches in thickness. The largest room measured thirty feet by fifteen feet, and eight other rooms were arranged round three sides of it. The two smallest rooms were each eleven feet by four feet. Mr. Bliss believes the ruins to be those of a public building. A little below the level of this building were also found at different places a bronze Egyptian idol, four inches high, with a gold collar, a bronze she-goat with two kids, a small figure in pottery, six inches long, considerable quantities of Phoenician pottery, and a wine-press. These remains appear to belong to the period which corresponds with the last of the Judges and the first three Jewish kings. The ruins of the next town which occupied the site indicate the return of a civilization which appreciated the value and strategic importance of the site. Along the north side of the Tell, and standing for about half

its thickness immediately over, though not directly upon the great Amorite walls already described, another wall was found, which is most probably part of the fortifications erected by Rehoboam, when in his small and weakened kingdom Lachish would acquire a position of influence and importance beyond that which it held in the large and powerful kingdom of Solomon, his father. Near the south side of the Tell, and at a level somewhat higher than the wall just mentioned, a curious building was found, which probably belongs also to the Rehoboam period. It is twenty-two feet ten inches by twenty-one feet eight inches, and appears to have had two doorways in each of the three sides examined. Lining one side of two of these doorways, the side exposed when the door stood open, was a slab of white limestone, four feet in height, bearing a pilaster in low relief with a carved volute, which suggested to Dr. Petrie a ram's horn nailed up against a wooden post, and this was most probably the origin of the design. Two similar slabs were found lying face downwards at two other doorways. These slabs had clearly been re-used from some other building of about the time of Solomon, and they afford a valuable specimen of the art of that period. The final dressing seems to have been done with flint scrapers. The building had been ruined by fire; charcoal and ashes covered the floor, and the limestone slabs bore marks of the intense heat to which they had been subjected.

A comparatively thin wall standing on the outer edge of Rehoboam's north wall is attributed to Jehoshaphat. The level is 298 feet and the date therefore about 910 B. C. That Jehoshaphat built "castles and cities of stone in Judah" we are told in 2 Chron. xviii., 12; and a strong city in the position of Lachish would not be wholly unconnected with the fact that "the Philistines brought Jehoshaphat presents and tribute silver." (ver. 11.) Another thin wall standing inside that just mentioned, Dr. Petrie believes to have been the work of Uzziah about 800 B. C. He points out that Uzziah built much, warred against the Philistines (2 Chron. xxv., 6), and "had much cattle in the low country" (ver. 10); that is the "Shephelah" or country extending for miles round Lachish, which place would be especially valuable because of its springs. The remains of another wall on the north side are associated with the name of Ahaz, to whose reign a fragment of wall and a flight of steps at the south-east edge of the fortification are also assigned. The next period distinctly represented is most probably the reign of Hezekiah. There are walls both on the north and south sides of the Tell, and a long glacis slope, thirty feet broad, faced with white plaster on the south, which appear to be-

long to about 700 B. C. Possibly these fortifications were erected by Hezekiah during his wars with the Philistines. (2 Kings xviii., 8.) We do know that the place was strongly fortified at the time of Sennacherib's invasion in 701 B. C. Our knowledge as to the appearance of the city at that date is gained from an unexpected quarter, and its identification is confirmed in a very remarkable way. Dr. Petrie writes as follows: "Every one who knows the Assyrian sculptures in the British Museum, is familiar with one of the largest compositions there—the siege of Lachish by Sennacherib. On looking at this, the truth of the geography of it is seen at once, when the site is known. The city stands on the sculpture with a gentle slope up to it on the left hand, a steeper slope in front and a vertical cliff directly down from the base of the wall on the right. This corresponds to the view from the south. The left side is the west, the only side on which the ground rises gently; the steep front is the south side; and the cliff on the right is the east side, which was always worn away steeply by the stream. The gateway in front of the town must be that of which the steps were found on the south leading up the glacis. Thence the captives are led away to the King at his camp on the right; this was therefore on the tongue of land between the Wady Muleihah and the Wady Jizair, where the wells above and wells below Lachish could both be reached, and where a great dam across the Wady Jizair probably retained a reservoir of water in those times. The valley with palms on the right must be the Wady Muleihah. This testing of a sculpture, executed in Assyria, hundreds of miles distant from the place, is of great interest, as it shows that some sketches and notes were actually made, probably by a royal designer attached to the court, or one of the secretaries. The essential points of the relative steepness of the three contiguous sides, the gateway, and the likely position for the camp, all show that the view is not a mere fancy piece."

Another series of walls was found above the ruins to which Sennacherib had reduced Lachish, and most probably these last fortifications were erected by Manasseh about 660 B. C. (2 Chron. xxxiii., 14.) Nebuchadnezzar besieged and took the city about 590 B. C., and from that blow it never seems to have recovered.

In addition to the various remains mentioned above, worked flints were found at almost all the levels along with the distinctive pottery of the various periods. Weights, seal-cylinders, scraps of bronze, a sheep bell, a hair-pin, needles, spear heads and many other small objects were collected during the course of the excavations. A peculiar circular structure about twelve feet in diameter,

which may possibly have been a blast furnace, was discovered by Mr. Bliss on one of the lower levels of the Tell.

For the results accruing from the recovery of Lachish within the last three years, and for a vast accumulation of facts brought together on scientific principles during the previous twenty-five years for the illustration and elucidation of the Bible, we are indebted to a society whose annual income is less than £3,000. As to the importance of the work there can surely be no doubt.

Large conclusions based on the purely literary criticism of the Old Testament are very unsafe, and many such conclusions have been shown to be without foundation by archeological research. Equally blameworthy, however, with those who make disturbing and exaggerated statements on insufficient evidence, are those who, through indifference or indolence, continue to repeat to intelligent congregations exploded fallacies and discredited interpretations. Every enlightened student of the Bible to-day expects and awaits a fuller revelation of the truth and power of the Word of God than was vouchsafed to our fathers, because he knows that while the Revelation itself was progressive, its interpretation has been progressive also.

ALEXANDER VINET: A PIONEER OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BY J. VERNON BARTLET, M. A., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

From *The Expository Times* (London), October, 1898.

What Schleiermacher has been to Germany; what men like Erskine of Linlathen, Robertson of Brighton, and Bushnell have been for various sections of the English-speaking peoples; that Alexander Vinet was, yea and is, for French-speaking Protestants. Each man must here speak for himself. But as the aim of this sketch is to reawaken evangelical Christians at large to a sense of the loss involved in suffering a luminary of the magnitude of Vinet to sink below their horizon, its writer, as one whose lot has been cast emphatically in the present spiritual generation, feels constrained to say quite simply, yet boldly, that there is more permanent light and leading in Vinet than in any one of the highly prophetic souls already named. Schleiermacher was indeed a more masterful genius, and developed under more manifold and brilliant personal influences; though it may be doubted whether, as a religious man and still more as a Christian—rather than a man of consummate culture—he did not thereby lose quite as much as he gained. But if greatness in a Christian thinker be measured by the actual amount of the "mind of Christ," which

a man vitally assimilates, and the faithfulness with which he preserves that balance among the Christian principles which constitutes the very *genius* or spirit of the gospel, then it is not too much to say that Vinet will not suffer by comparison with the greatest "of the school of Christ," to use the phrase applied to him by *Sainte-Beuve*.

Be this as it may, one thing is certain—namely, that Vinet goes far to explain the noblest elements in French Protestantism of the last half century. So that, if we seek for the secret of the large, sympathetic, progressive, yet assured faith of men like a *De Pressensé* and a *Bersier*, we must reckon intelligently with the sensitive, often solitary, thinker of Lausanne, who in his retirement went so deep down into the human soul—universal humanity, as it were, in and beneath the particular—and disclosed the gospel of Christ as implied in its essential constitution, its aspirations, and its needs. Vinet had none of that superficial originality, which consists in realising some truth in so masterful a fashion as to force it out of perspective, and thus convey the impression of novelty. He was original, rather, in the nobler sense, that he penetrated to the origins of human life, where the human blends with the divine. Thus his conception of Christianity stands firm, and his spirit is abreast of the most thoughtful Christian spirits of to-day. Moreover, when we remember how Vinet the Christian was one and the same with Vinet the *littérateur*, it is significant of his calibre that so modern a critic as *M. Brunetière* has confessed how often he has found his best ideas anticipated by Vinet.

His external life was singularly uneventful. But if it be true that "the decisive events of the world take place in the mind," it is equally true that Vinet's mind was the arena in which met, and only after years of *travail intérieur* came to reconciliation, forces and factors of change that have seldom been equalled in history. The early years of this century were charged with a sense of unrest and revolution, for which the political upheaval of 1789 had created the pervasive atmosphere. In England the outcome of this shaking of traditional conceptions led, in the religious sphere, not so much to healthy development, by absorption of the new fruitful ideas, whether philosophic or historical, as to obscurantist reaction, the outcome of fear rather than of faith. The result being, that the present generation, including the writers of *Lux Mundi*, is struggling with arrears of unreconciled elements in the realm of our higher thought, for which the "ostrich policy" of the Tractarians is largely responsible. Patristic authority, "Church principles," and the antique in ritual were barriers which could not long avail, when conscience and reason were pressing for larger and franker recog-

nition, side by side with faith, under the roof-tree of the Church. It was otherwise on the Continent. There, within the sphere of Protestantism at least, the irrelevancies of authority devoid of inner basis of authentication in the soul itself—which is no religious authority—were not interposed between religious men and the issues. Accordingly, Vinet was fronted by the inevitable problem of the “old” and “new” theology—the theology which was an amalgam of the Protestant doctrine of Justification by Faith and the scholastic or traditional method of “Catholicism,” as contrasted with that which was Protestant through and through, appealing to the renewed conscience for verification of the system as well as of its basis.

Born at Ouchy, “the Piraeus of Lausanne,” in 1797, Alexander Vinet early found himself in the midst of the conflict between the “old” and the “new.” First of all there was his father, Marc Vinet, who was a fine specimen of the intelligent French Puritan of the best eighteenth century type, to whom the tradition of his Church was something so fixed, that re-examination of it by the individual seemed to smack of profanity; while Holy Scripture was so august *per se* as to be able to guarantee Christ and His gospel *ab extra*, itself being approved, if such a thing were necessary, by its prophecy and miracles rather than by its relation to Christ on His own merits. Trained by such a father he was sufficiently under the influence of the old orthodoxy when he went at the age of twenty-one to teach French literature at Basle, where his spiritual *Wanderjahre* began in earnest. His “innate love of truth and candour” and his “dread lest speech should outrun sincere conviction,” together with the rapid enlargement of his mental horizon through his serious study of literature as a revelation of the human soul, caused his sensitive conscience much heart-searching. And it is clear that, absorbed in the study of ideas, he might have become a very Amiel in his all-round self-dissatisfaction, had not his affections found an outlet, leading to a deepening of character and insight, in the pure love that breathes in the correspondence between himself and his future wife. From her he learnt not only something of the nature of true piety, but also, by experience, how “the idea of God is linked with all pure and deep affections”—the germ of his later doctrine of the interpenetration of the truly human by the divine. Already he can say Amen to Schiller’s confession, “I own it frankly, I believe in the reality of disinterested love; I am lost if it does not exist, and I renounce belief in divinity, immortality, and virtue;” and he adds, *à propos* of Lamartine’s *Meditations*, “If it can be proved that poets are charlatans and that we are dupes, I renounce the study of poetry”—words that give

us a glimpse into the serious spirit in which he was prosecuting his study of literature. Already, too, he has felt that “Liberty alone can develop and ripen thought.” Accordingly, his spiritual emancipation was in various ways already in process before the coming of De Wette to Basle introduced him to the freer and more historic methods of German theological science. Hitherto theology had forgotten that “exegesis is the parent, and not the maid-of-all-work of dogma” (Astié); and Vinet was quick to note the greater reality of the new exegesis. But he was not to be carried away by any current tendency to divorce Christian morality and positive doctrine based on the Christian facts. Where this latter is set forth in its unargumentative simplicity, he holds it “equally impossible to believe without practising, and to practise without believing.” Briefly speaking, then, this dictum contains the germ of his whole life’s problem—namely, How so to grasp and state the ultimate Christian facts that, in relation to them, belief and practice shall be necessary correlative? From this standpoint he soon saw that faith does not call upon us “to penetrate the mystery of the divine essence, nor to grope our way in the uncertain glimmer of a subtle system of metaphysics,” ere we are entitled to be recognized as true Christians. “Religion is not a science: it is not a series of external facts submitted to our reason. . . . It is by the heart we shall learn if the Messiah who appeared in Judæa at a certain period is a Being whose coming was necessitated by the craving of the human soul. It is by the heart that we shall learn to know if the Holy Spirit is really essential to our increase in holiness; and we may say the same with regard to all the other doctrines.” These words were written in September, 1824, after he had been quickened in his sense for personal religion by the warm and vital piety manifest in some of the finer spirits touched by the *Réveil* movement, and by his own personal experience when face to face with death in the latter part of 1823.¹ They breathe the same spirit as his remark, in speaking of Erskine’s *Reflexions on the Intrinsic Evidence of Christianity*, to the effect that “though we cannot conceive the ‘how’ of the mysteries of religion, the ‘why’ is perfectly accessible to our reason.” To this end, “to study our own heart, and to consult the religious experience of those who have consecrated their lives to the service of Christ—this is the first means. To study the Gospel and some of the books that explain and apply its system—this is the second.” Here, then, we have already in *nuce* Vinet’s distinctive conception, his Christian in-

¹ This period is recognized by Vinet himself as marking an epoch in his life; and its significance appears in the fact that what now most strikes him about De Wette is his deficiency in constructive effort.

dividualisme, which, as emphasising the moral conscience in preference to consciousness in general, builds upon the most universal elements in man, which in turn involve truths as to the divine nature that have the highest objective validity. Thus its affinity is not so much with Schleiermacher's "Individuality" and his highly subjective *Glaubenslehre*, as with Frank's mode of thought in his *System of Christian Certainty*, which makes the experience of regeneration the basis of Apologetic and Dogmatic.

So much space has been devoted to the growth of Vinet's personal religion and his corresponding convictions, that we can notice his subsequent career only in its relation to modifications in his maturer thought, as indicated by his strictly religious writings. For neither his nobly ethical literary criticism, nor even his strivings for religious and ecclesiastical liberty, fall directly within our present scope. Schérer has thus summarised Vinet's central thought of the vital interpenetration of creed and conduct, faith and action, in the veritable gospel. "Conduct demands a motive power, which cannot be anything but an affection; this affection needs an awakening—an inspiring fact; this fact is realised in redemption, which is only dogma because it is first fact. Such was his conception of Christianity." At various times, however, marked roughly by the *Discourses on certain Religious Subjects* (1831), the *New Discourses* (1841), and the *Evangelical Studies* (1847), he worked out more fully certain distinct aspects of the subject. The aim of the *Discourses* was similar to that of Schleiermacher's *Speeches upon Religion*, addressed, as he puts it, "to its cultured despisers." Their audiences no doubt differed somewhat. Still each writer believed that the indifference deprecated, had causes other than the inevitable prejudice of the "natural man" against the element of surrender involved in "the obedience of faith." If we may adapt some famous lines, we may say that both held that, in a sense,

"Christ is a master of so gracious mien,
As to be welcomed needs but to be seen;"

that religion, whether as an idea or as a need of human nature, was so implied in the very constitution of humanity, that even the "natural" man could not but feel some responsive emotion in his being awakened, if but for a moment, when the appropriate religious object was immediately presented in native simplicity and purity to his sensibility, apart from all the conventional trappings of a scholastic orthodoxy. Alike, therefore, they restored religion afresh to the language of literature. But the religion which Vinet had at heart was by no means identical with that of Schleiermacher's *Reden*. While sensibility meant to the latter a certain pervasive artistic sense,

to the former it was rather conscience—an intuitive recognition of "whatsoever things are true, worthy of reverence (*σεμνὰ*), just, pure, lovely,"¹ such as might deepen into an awestruck sense of personal deficiency and demerit. A sense for beauty might be included, but it was for "the beauty of holiness." No doubt these conceptions are capable of converging in the idea of the Sublime; but the impression produced is quite different in each case. The atmosphere of the one is Romanticist and philosophic; of the other, ethical and religious. And these differences come out decisively in the prominence accorded to Christ in the two presentations; though the contrast is lessened by the "Explanations" subsequently appended by Schleiermacher to his discourses. Still the tendency underlying both was the same. Thus Vinet relied, for personal or vital conviction, upon the internal self-evidencing power of Christianity; the more so that even if the external evidences led a man to the water of life, they could not give him the desire to drink.² Again he saw the danger latent in the current dualism between the "natural" and "supernatural" as such, a dualism on which Revivalist theology at home and elsewhere was laying undue stress. He saw that there must be some bond between the natural and the regenerate man, other than the mere creative act of God, some point of contact, not totally effaced by man's sinful estate, which could ensure personal identity even where the "old man" gave place to the "new." And this he found in the rudiments of conscience in human nature as such, when fairly and sympathetically regarded;³ although the unifying principle of selfhood, rather than filial trust, vitiated the *tout-ensemble*. Hence he recognized implicitly from the first, and explicitly in his *New Discourses*, a moral element in the faith demanded by Christ,⁴ an idea which he set forth in an epoch-making sermon on Faith as a *work*, the "work of God" (John vi. 29.) In this and other attempts to do justice to both the divine and human factors in regeneration and in

¹ Phil. iv. 8.

² This was the radical defect of the "orthodox form of rationalism"—an inheritance from both seventeenth and eighteenth century Apologetics and Dogmatics—which Vinet found in the *Revival*, as well as in the current "Moderatism" of the pulpit.

³ No account of Vinet would be complete even in principle, which omitted reference to his affinity with Pascal (whose most sympathetic interpreter he became), especially as regards the harmony of the gospel with the needs and aspirations of the human soul. Yet Vinet maintains his originality even here. For not only did he emphasise man's sense of sin and duty, rather than that intellectual misery so subtly set forth by Pascal; but he never put faith and reason into the hopeless antithesis, in which the latter gloried to a morbid degree. Rather, he more and more tended to regard them as two distinct functions of the essential rationality of the soul, considered as the correlate of the uniform, though variously mediated, truth of God. Herein "the Pascal of Protestantism" has seen further into the significance of the Incarnation than even the Evangelical Catholic who wrote the *Short Life of Jesus*. Thus he says: "The glory of the gospel is not only to be found in its having made truth *divine*, but in having made it *human*. It touches by its two extremities the mystery of the divine essence and the mystery of human nature. The two elements, human and divine, are not the two terms of an antinomy, but two poles of truth." ("Theology of the Pensees.")

⁴ For an attempt to draw out this thought exegetically, see *Expositor*, June, 1892.

the gospel as a whole, Vinet found his reconciliation of all antinomies in the Person and Work of Christ, in whom the two natures united with obvious harmony *in fact*, whatever difficulty there might be in a theory. Nor was one needed at the experimental stage of moral appropriation by personal trust. Thus he felt his way to the great truth, towards which we have been tending since his day,—namely, that it is the image of Christ, as He stands forth, a spiritual unity, to the look of need, that authenticates Christianity and the sufficiency of Bible and Church as the media through which externally He reaches the individual; while on the inner side the immanent Spirit of God witnesses with our consciences that He is Lord of the conscience and its redeemer.¹

Perhaps the climax of his progress towards a complete innerness of conception, to which "faith" ceases to anything short of a receptivity of the whole personality,—reason, emotion, will,—uniting the believer really, if implicitly, in a spiritual union with God in Christ which itself constitutes salvation or eternal life—this climax is reached in one of his latest meditations, entitled "Looking." *Croire c'est regarder*, is the legitimate outcome of his whole development. This, while recalling the chaste mysticism of William Law, has yet more direct affinity with those mystical passages in which Paul's thought finds its most personal utterance apart from the Jewish setting in which he is often obliged to frame it, as well as with the characteristically Johannine attitude.² Mysticism is a term at which many look vaguely askance. But that mysticism which is the mature outcome of the assimilation of all the earlier phases of Christian experience, comes to us not only as the last word of a Paul and a John, but also with a certain suggestion of absoluteness on its very face. For it yields a point of view from which justification and sanctification melt away into one another, as the implicit into the explicit form of one supreme consciousness of divine fellowship or community of life. In it he at last transcended the "orthodox rationalism" of the older theology, whether in its method of external "proofs," or in its idea of salvation by dogmas, some of which were conceived as the arbitrary contents of justifying faith, some as the bare sanctions of the requisite degree of virtue to be

¹ "There are," says Vinet, "two modes of conceiving Christianity—(1) as the reign of visible authority; (2) as the reign of the Holy Spirit. This latter says, 'You are all taught of God.' . . . In the judgment of some persons, all this is rationalism; for others it is pure mysticism; in our eyes it is simply the gospel. . . . The gospel can be nothing else than *spiritual*, otherwise the principle is denied which Jesus Christ established at great cost—the principle of the immediate relations of man with God . . . of *religious individuality*."

² In justifying his mature judgment that "Antinomianism" was "one of the weaknesses of the *Revival*," he wrote a few days before his death: "It would ill become the disciples of the gospel to take from St. Paul only that which distinguishes him from his companions, and not that which they all have in common. As a fact, all St. John is to be found in St. Paul; but how many students of the Bible seem never to have made the discovery!" Surely this is a "biblical" or "exegetical theologian" before his age!

attained by the believer, but all very imperfectly homogeneous with the human spirit to be regenerated and transfigured by their aid. In it, then, his idea of a really "vital Christianity" found its final fulfilment.

Now that we are less likely to misunderstand his true meaning, let us hear Vinet speak in his own inimitable way. "Revealed truth is only human, because it is divine, and only divine on condition of being human. Man carries within him the twofold need of giving himself wholly to God and of remaining holy man. All heresies which are born in the bosom of Christianity belittle either man or God. The religion of the heart, which is a living faith, maintains an admirable equilibrium between these two extremes; while theology has great difficulty in preventing itself from inclining to one or the other. Why? Because it remains always below the summit of the angle; while living faith, throned on the apex, commands the two sides, or two slopes, of truth without inclining to one more than the other. It is the work of the theologian to distinguish between the two . . . and theology belittles by turns divinity and humanity. . . . This conflict takes many different names; but its identity remains the same. It is in philosophy the inexhaustible question of the subjective and the objective. Philosophy has not yet understood that the Incarnation of the Word is the supreme and unique solution of the problem. For *ipso facto* it is face to face with *impersonal reason*. The Christian believes in personal and supreme reason, which is Jesus Christ." We confess that Ritschl does not seem to us to have improved on this position either in balance or in truth.

But we should be sorry to convey the idea that Vinet did not linger long at many transitional points on the way towards this goal. For such was not the case. And, further, had it been so, those who have learnt to occupy the same position themselves, would have had less confidence in its permanence than they now feel, seeing that a man of Vinet's noble conservatism of temper has been with infinite patience over the road from beginning to end. No "neologian" he; but one in whose pure and humble person the new theology was born out of the old with travail-pangs that witness to the full continuity of life. This should serve to embolden some who hesitate to commit themselves to the liberty of sole and immediate dependence upon God in Christ, attested by the Spirit of Regeneration and Holiness energising in the pulses of the soul's needs and satisfactions, both in their own persons and in those of dutiful, saintly, and self-forgetful men from the first even to the last "bondservant of Jesus Christ." It may also serve to give pause to any inclined hastily to acquiesce in certain rather jejune and

"positivist" conceptions of Christianity and of life as seen in its light. For the Vinet, whose breadth of view and large humanity made his criticisms welcome to the *littérateurs* and thinkers of his day, was an eminently sane Christian, and no fanciful enthusiast. At a time, then, when the exact type of Christianity to be approved is often a matter of some doubt to even pious souls, "the spirit of Alexander Vinet," which endears him to many others besides M. Astié, his faithful interpreter, may well be recommended to thoughtful Christians everywhere. It may be gathered not only from the excellent sketch of his *Life and Writings* by Miss Lane,¹ but also from his *Vital Christianity* and *Gospel Studies*, or again from the *Outlines of Theology*,² an anthology gathered from his works by the master-hand of Professor Astié.

Vinet died in May, 1847, at Lausanne, where he spent the last decade of his life, a powerful factor in the life of his native Canton, not only by his professorial lectures and literary productions, but also through the leading part played by him in the formation of the *Église libre*. Its creed and constitution—even as they stand—are an abiding monument to his enlightened, catholic, and profoundly Christian piety. Yet touching both, his ideal was in advance of what he could get his brethren to adopt. As to Constitution, he desired even fuller recognition of the laity, wishing that pastors should be consecrated with the aid of the elders; for "it is the Church that consecrates, not the clergy." As to the creed, he would have had it yet more religious and experimental than was even the simple form finally adopted. "If," he writes, "it be necessary that the church confess its faith, it is certainly essential that the form of this confession be accessible to the humblest servant, the most ignorant workman, if only they are Christian, and that each article should find an echo in their hearts. Every other system leads us unconsciously . . . to the *faith of authority* and to the *principle of tradition*."

But, after all, the spirit of Vinet cannot be really conveyed by an epitome. For as a writer he was eminently *distingué*. There is an incom- munciable charm in the fine way in which he throws out his lucid and suggestive ideas. Take the following as examples: Conscience, as a primitive fact of our nature, is "a necessity to make our actions harmonize with our convictions." "Repentance is a grace." "The morality of the gospel is known only by him in whom it has produced the need of something more." "Christianity is morality planted in the soil of grace" Ac-

cordingly, as well as for the deeper reason that the part is only true when seen in the light of the whole, no man can appreciate Vinet at his true worth who has not handled some of his writings. And he who has communed with him, in the *Outlines of Theology* for instance, will ever after be at once a deeper, a more courageous, a more balanced thinker; and, what is even higher, a nobler Christian.

PHILIP SCHAFF.

From *The New York Evangelist* (Presb.) October 26, 1893.

JANUARY 1, 1819—OCTOBER 20, 1893.

"*Christianus sum; Christiani nihil a me alienum puto*" ("I am a Christian; nothing which relates to Christ is a matter of indifference to me"). This adaptation of Terence's famous line appears on the title page of each successive volume of Dr. Schaff's "History of the Christian Church," and was indeed a fitting motto for the work and at the same time a characterization of its author. Dr. Schaff was a Christian. He had a profound reverence for the name of Christ. But he went much further than to revere the name; he worshipped Christ. In the early part of his life Strauss had the ear of German students, and later the shallower scepticism of Renan and Schenkel stirred up controversy. Dr. Schaff had read these men and had studied under Baur, but his answer to their arguments was his "Person of Christ; the Miracle of History." He says: "The person of Christ is the great central miracle of history, and the strongest evidence of Christianity. The very perfection of His humanity is a proof of His divinity. The indwelling of God in Him is the only satisfactory solution of the problem of His amazing character. . . . Christ lives in me, and He is the only valuable part of my being. I am nothing without my Saviour. I am all with Him, and would not exchange Him for ten thousand worlds." So he wrote in 1865, and in the same vein in the last month of his life he said again and again: "My only hope is that Jesus Christ died for sinners." Christ was a reality to him, and much that he wrote relates directly to Him. Thus his best work as a commentator was on the Gospel of John; his favorite thought was that theology should be Christocentric; one of his most widely circulated books was the "Person of Christ"; one of his English collections of religious poetry was "Christ in Song"; and one of his latest collections of essays bears the title, "Christ and Christianity." To him the kingdom of God was one, and he looked forward to a time when the divisions of the Christian Church would be healed in answer to the Saviour's prayer, "that they all may be one." Christ was to him the

¹ Edinburgh, 1890: T. & T. Clark. The classical French biography is that by E. Rambert. Other Vinet literature is given by Miss Lane.

² This includes some of the profoundest and most suggestive remarks on Christian Ethics—"the morality which abounds in the gospel itself"—which was eminently Vinet's *forte*.

Peace-maker, the Centre of attraction in whom the controversies of Christendom would find their solution.

Flowing naturally from his affectionate and profound appreciation of the Perfect Life, was his unqualified regard for all that exalted Christ, and his equally pronounced antipathy to all that dishonored Christ. Thus he lived out the second part of his motto, for "nothing which related to Christ was a matter of indifference" to him. It was to the Church which Christ had founded that he gave his life. He studied that Church from all sides and through all periods. It was in the spirit of loyalty to Christ that he wrote his great history. And it was the Spirit of Jesus which made him so tolerant, so just, so unprejudiced. The first volume of his Church History is on the New Testament times, and is based upon an independent study of the sources. He possessed a minute knowledge of the Greek New Testament, could quote large portions of it in Greek, and had examined for himself all questions which relate to it. He kept up his reading of New Testament commentaries and introductions to the last, and the revision of the first volume of his Church History, which was issued this year, shows that he was ready to adopt new views if well founded. But every one of the six volumes of this great work is witness of the extraordinary freshness of his information. He was eager to learn, and incorporated in each successive edition of his works the most recent discoveries.

Dr. Schaff took as warm an interest in all practical Christian movements as he did in scholastic and exegetical questions touching Christ. He welcomed each new form of Christian activity, which seemed adapted to carry good to men. Just before his stroke of paralysis, in July, 1892, he visited the great convention of the Christian Endeavor Society in New York, and was deeply stirred by its enthusiasm; during his last year he came in close contact with the leaders and workers of the Salvation Army, and expressed his appreciation of their work; and at Chicago, a few weeks before his death, he greatly desired to hear Mr. Moody once again. In his last volume, "Theological Propaedeutic," he speaks of "the remarkable work of the Salvation Army, a sort of aggressive military Christianity, impelled by a truly Apostolic spirit, and followed by rich results in the English-speaking world."

It was also the living out of his motto when he undertook to do his share towards uniting Christendom. The last gathering he attended was the recent Parliament of Religions, held in Chicago, and there he pleaded for Christian Union, pronouncing the Parliament a religious epoch. The vision of Christian unity did indeed always float before his open eyes. His own tem-

per was decidedly irenical and unionistic. From his lofty tower of faith and knowledge he surveyed the hosts battling upon the plain. He knew full well what they were fighting about. None better. But he hoped for a cessation of the fight and agreement of peace, at least for a truce till they might bury their dead. Dr. Schaff was no trimmer or coward. He was not frightened at the noise of the battle, nor anxious to flee to a place of safety. It was not for himself, but for the Church he loved that he looked and labored for peace. How much he actually accomplished the Day of Judgment will show, but this generation saw his activity and marveled at it, and many rejoiced in it. John Dury in the seventeenth century labored assiduously in the same good cause, and likewise traveled all over Europe on his errands. But he had no organization back of him, and so much of the good he did was "interred with his bones." Dr. Schaff lived in a more favorable time. He was the founder and ardent supporter of the American branch of the Evangelical Alliance, and one of the leaders in the Alliance of the Reformed Churches. He pleaded their cause, and was never weary of showing that a better acquaintance among Christians would result in mutual respect and hearty co-operation. The success of the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York in 1873 was largely owing to his efforts, as was that of the meeting of the Alliance of the Reformed Churches in Philadelphia in 1880. And it is pleasant to know that the last strength of his life was spent upon the paper entitled, "The Re-union of Christendom," prepared for the Chicago Parliament of Religions, already alluded to. Never did he express himself more clearly and more eloquently than in that paper. Particularly impressive and characteristic is the closing section, in which he passes in review, with the skill of a master, the different Churches which together make up the Church for which Christ died, and gives his praise to each for its fidelity to some phase of truth, and then he says, as his final words, and surely they complete his irenic to the world: "There is room for all these and many other Churches and societies in the kingdom of God, whose height and depth and length and breadth, variety and beauty, surpass human comprehension."

Dr. Schaff's literary activity was extraordinarily varied. It was as a church historian that he first came into notice, and in this department he did much of his best work. He cultivated all branches of the subject. Thus, besides writing a formal history, he collected and commented on the "Creeds of Christendom," brought out an edition of "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and also an edition of the English translation of the works of Augustine and Chrysostom, and, in con-

junction with Dr. Wace, of London, the Post-Nicene Fathers in English translation. In so doing he supplied a felt want in providing good translations of the most important sources for the periods they cover. He also rendered available to the English reader the wealth of German learning contained in Herzog's *Real Encyclopädie*, by bringing out the standard "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge." In adapting this work to the wants of the English reader, he added much material to that given in the German original. He furnished materials for contemporary church history in his "Encyclopedia of Living Divines."

Dr. Schaff did very much to popularise Bible study by providing the best helps. He edited a translation of Lange's voluminous commentary upon the Scriptures, and to it added an original American commentary upon the Apocrypha, prepared by Dr. E. C. Bissell. He edited for the American Sunday School Union a "Bible Dictionary," which is confessedly one of the best of its class. He edited a "Popular Commentary" upon the entire New Testament. To all these books he contributed himself. He wrote "Through Bible Lands," an account of a journey he had made through those countries, which is a valuable summary of scholarship on Biblical topography. His interest in Bible Revision and his knowledge of the subject he manifested in his "Companion to the Greek New Testament."

He also entered the field of hymnology. Allusion has been made to his "Christ in Song," but he edited the "*Deutsches Gesangbuch*" and "*Deutsches Sonntagsschulgesangbuch*," and contributed largely to Julian's recently issued "Dictionary of Hymnology." Hymnology was indeed a favorite study. Perhaps one might call it his recreation.

He was an authority in liturgic and was chairman of the committee which prepared the liturgy of the Reformed (German) Church. Not the least of his services was his "Christian Catechism for Sunday Schools and Families," a little work which has had a wide circulation, and which admirably presents Christian truth in a way to be grasped by youthful minds.

This enormous literary activity was carried on simultaneously with his career as a teacher. He began as a tutor in Berlin University in the year 1842, but came in 1844, in obedience to what was really a divine call, to the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church at Mercersburg. There he stayed until 1863, when he removed to New York, and from 1864 till 1869 was secretary of the New York Sabbath Committee, lecturing meanwhile on Church History in the Theological Seminaries in Andover, Hartford, and New York (Union). In 1870 he accept-

ed the professorship of Theological Encyclopedia and Christian Symbolism in Union Theological Seminary, and there he taught till his death. In 1887 he was transferred to the Chair of Church History on the death of Dr. Hitchcock, and when he resigned in April, 1893, he was made Professor *Emeritus* of Church History and Lecturer on Pro-paedeutic and Symbolic. He returned from his summering in his beloved Lake Mohonk, and his visit to the World's Fair at Chicago with enthusiastic determination to take up his lectureship in spite of the counsel of friends and physician to spare himself. He delivered one lecture on Pro-paedeutic to the Junior class, but it was his last. At Mercersburg he taught at times in every department, and in Union he occupied, in addition to the chairs already mentioned, Chairs of Hebrew and of Sacred Literature.

Dr. Schaff was a man of remarkable learning. His birthplace was at Coire, in Southeastern Switzerland, where he first saw the light on January 1, 1819, but his education was in Germany, at the gymnasium at Stuttgart, and at the universities of Tübingen, Halle, and Berlin. His early training must have been thorough, and he must have toiled terribly. His memory was phenomenal. It held like a vise all that he put into it. And his was a ready mind. His enormous acquisitions were at immediate command. His statements of a theological, exegetical, or historical character needed not to be verified, but were sure to be accurate as far as they went. With him yesterday's gains were the foundation for to-day's work. Thus, as the years went on, he had more and more intellectual wealth.

Dr. Schaff was also a man of affairs. He had executive ability of a high order. A good judge of character and always knowing what he wanted, he was entrusted with important business in which many co-operated, and discharged his trusts with signal success because he knew how to choose his lieutenants. He first showed this power on the Sabbath Committee. In its behalf he travelled over the country and organized local committees and arranged public meetings. In this way he multiplied himself manyfold and gave the cause the best presentation. He next showed it in his staff of contributors on the translation and adaptation of Lang's Commentary. His most conspicuous service in this line was the Bible Revision movement. He was chosen by the English committee to organize the American Revision Committee, and was its President till death. It was strange that a Swiss should be at the head of the American revisers of the English Bible, but by common consent there was no one in the country so competent as he to occupy this position. His adoption of American ideas as to the Lord's Day, and his devotion to the cause of Bible revision,

evinced the thoroughness of his naturalization. Born under republican institutions in Switzerland, he was in full sympathy with American institutions. He was their enthusiastic defender. In 1854, on a visit to Germany, he delivered a course of lectures, afterwards incorporated in a volume entitled "America." On the same visit, in answer to a request of the editor of this paper, he prepared a series of articles on German universities and their professors, which he published under the caption, "German Universities."

In 1888 he organized the American Society of Church History, which now numbers nearly two hundred members. He was its first and only President, and contributed to each volume of its papers. He carefully planned for its growth and permanent usefulness, had prepared a paper for its coming meeting in December, and hoped to be able to preside at least over one of its sessions.

Dr. Schaff died in harness. He had just issued an elaborate volume upon "Theological Propaedeutic," which showed that his mental vigor was as great as ever, and he was planning to resume work upon the second part of his treatment of Mediæval Church History. But a recurrence of that dread malady—angina pectoris—from which he had suffered seven years before, compelled him to stop work, and on Wednesday, October 18th, a second stroke of paralysis deprived him of the power of speech, and he gradually sank till death came to his relief at a quarter to eight o'clock on the following Friday morning, October 20th.

There was no better known man in the theological world than Dr Schaff. He had friends and acquaintances in all literary centers, and admirers everywhere. He made friends wherever he went. And they were won by his charming manners, his comradeship, his rare intelligence, his catholicity and simplicity. He was the farthest possible remove from a "tuft hunter," but he enjoyed intimacy with the leaders of thought in Europe and America. Nor was his acquaintance limited to Protestants. He was equally welcome in Roman Catholic circles. He was indeed in every aspect a remarkable man. Of tireless energy, of a practical order of mind, ambitious for the public welfare, devoted to the cause of Christ, a Swiss by birth, a German by training, an American from choice, extraordinarily learned and versatile, easy of access, wholly free from vanity and pedantry, courteous in manner, full of anecdote, optimistic in temper, he played for many years a leading part in American church history. Coming here a promising youth, he died a veteran of rich fulfilment. The lesson of such a life is plainly written. It is this: Consecration to the noblest ends surely leads to the highest usefulness.

"LEAD, KINDLY LIGHT."

BY THE REV. T. VINCENT TYMMS.

From *Good Words* (London) October, 1898

John Henry Newman is more widely known and better loved as the author of the hymn, "Lead, kindly Light," than as the leader of the Oxford movement or as a cardinal of the Roman Church. Christians of all communions and of every grade of culture feel the charm of these musical words, and find in them a language for some of the deepest yearnings of the soul. Yet to myriads the hymn is a source of painful perplexity. All thoughtful Protestants have asked: "How could one who thus sought the leading of God's light come at last to a cardinal's chair? How can we harmonize such an appeal to the Father of Lights with the writer's sincerity, and at the same time with the divine faithfulness?" Roman Catholics, of course, are not troubled by any such questions. They say, with exultation, "Observe how beautifully this prayer has been answered!" It was the plaintive cry of a human spirit wandering, as he truly felt, far from his "home," among wild wastes of heretical and self-trustful thought, yet longing for such guidance and peace as Anglicanism was unable to afford—such peace as he only found after years of unconscious rebellion by submitting to the Holy Mother Church. On the other hand, total disbelievers in a prayer-hearing God are not at all bewildered by Newman's subsequent history. In their view a man who was capable of writing such verses was already on the high road to the thick darkness of superstition. They tell us that Newman miserably abased himself, and renounced the manly duty of self-guidance, while saying "Pride ruled my will." Their view is that one who could resign himself to walk without a determined goal or path, and was content to go plunging on "o'er crags and seas" without looking two steps ahead, was sure to go deeper and deeper into darkness; was just the man to follow any fen-fire which might raise a sickly light above its native morass; just the man to yield the government of his mind to any strong commanding voice which challenged his unquestioning obedience, and so a most likely individual to sink at last into such a bog of superstition as the Romish Church.

For most of us neither the Agnostic nor the Romanist view is satisfactory; each may be allowed to quicken thought and suggest inquiry, but the mystery remains. Only the great Father of Lights can even now read all that was passing through Newman's soul when this lay gushed from his heart, but it is possible to clear away some of our perplexity by a closer study of his inner life. Such a study will show that when Newman wrote "Lead, kindly Light," he was not, as multitudes

suppose, a bewildered thinker troubled by the deeper problems of spiritual religion, but had already abjured the right of private judgment, and was a Romanist in all but a few points on which he inconsistently continued to hold independent opinions for about a dozen years.

In other ways Newman was unlike the imaginary being with whose conflicts and contrition many sympathise while thrilled with his voicing of their own unutterable thoughts. Were it possible to read this hymn as the composition of an unknown author some sixty years since, we might well imagine that this nameless person had spent a gay if not riotous youth, and so found by experience the vanity of sensuous pleasure, the "bitterness of things too sweet," the disastrous consequences of a proud self-rule. We might suppose that, in defiance of the inward monitor, he had stiffly claimed and held the right to please himself and to lean upon his own understanding, until chastening griefs, tempered by subduing mercies, taught the wisdom of humility and the blessedness of being guided through all the rough and lonely places of religious thought and moral difficulty into the land of light and uprightness. Looking at the date, 1833, we should say, "This traveler has long since closed his pilgrimage! Guided by the Light he so earnestly desired he has surely crossed each moor and fen, each crag and torrent safely. His face was towards the dawn, and without doubt the dawn, moving faster than his feet, has met him; he has found Peniel, and has also seen the smile of 'angel faces' in the city of the saints."

No Christian heart will fail to cherish the hope that John Newman has indeed found the heavenly goal, but it will help this faith if we see what a thick intellectual veil shut out the light from Newman's soul, and how all the forces of inward loyalty to truth were enlisted on the side of submission to ecclesiastical authority, as the lamp which screens and transmits the light of heaven.

In the year of the great Reform Bill Newman's health broke down under the strain of literary labor and controversial excitement. Hating Liberalism and all its works, political and theological, he fled to the South of Europe. The scope of this article will not permit a full recital of his creed at this time, but the deepest seam of sentiment and conviction crops out in the verses of this period. Under date "Oxford, Nov. 25, 1832," he wrote these beautiful but strangely superstitious lines on the "Sign of the Cross":—

"Whene'er across this sinful flesh of mine
I draw the Holy Sign,
All good thoughts stir within me, and renew
Their slumbering strength divine;
Till there springs up a courage high and true
To suffer and to do.

"And who shall say, but hateful spirits around,
For their brief hour unbound,
Shudder to see, and wail their overthrow?
While on far heathen ground
Some lonely Saint hails the fresh odour, though
Its source he cannot know."

A few weeks later, and while on board a sailing-ship off Cape Ortegal, he wrote his poem entitled "Private Judgment," which is an appeal to "Liberal Christians" to renounce that exercise of reason without which, as we believe, no man can receive or walk in the light of divine truth:—

"Poor wand'lers, ye are sore distress'd
To find that path which Christ has bless'd,
Track'd by His saintly throng;
Each claims to trust his own weak will,
Blind idol! so ye languish still,
All wranglers and all wrong.

"He saw of old, and met your need,
Granting you prophets of His creed,
The throes of fear to swage;
They fenced the rich bequest He made,
And sacred hands have safe convey'd
Their charge from age to age.

"Wand'lers, come home! obey the call!
A Mother pleads, who'll ne'er let fall
One grain of Holy Truth;
Warn you and win she shall and must,
For now she lifts her from the dust,
To reign as in her youth."

It is pathetic, yet to weary thinkers veering round towards authority for rest it is noteworthy that when these lines were written Newman deemed the Anglican Church his mother, and in her name gave his touching invitation to "come home." But the most significant point in this pregnant poem is its identification of "private judgment" with "self-will." In this respect it becomes an instructive comment on the words "Pride ruled my will." In the same month, "Off Ithaca," he wrote words in which, under the phrase "heretic, self-trusting guide," he classed Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, with all Liberal Churchmen and Nonconformists, among the deadliest snares to be avoided by a child of God. How sincerely he meant and how terribly he obeyed this warning may be known by his subsequent actions.

For many months Newman lingered about the Mediterranean coasts and visited the towns of Italy. For the most part he avoided intimate intercourse with Roman Catholics, though he called twice on Cardinal Wiseman in Rome. His thoughts were still of England, and as news came telling of Liberal measures and successes, he declares, "I had fierce thoughts against the Liberals," and again, "It was the success of the Liberal cause which fretted me inwardly. I became fierce against its instruments and manifestations. A French vessel was at Algiers; I could not even look at the tricolor." As

strength returned he became imbued with the thought that he had a work to do in England, and fretted like an impatient war-horse for the battle. While in Rome, he and H. Froude commenced to publish a series of verses in the *British Magazine*, and the motto, selected from Homer, was the saying of Achilles on returning to the war: "You shall know the difference when I am back again."

Filled with these feelings he went to Sicily and was stricken with fever. His servant thought that he was dying, and begged for instructions. He gave them, but added: "I shall not die, I shall not die, for I have not sinned against light, I have not sinned against light." Years afterwards he was unable to say what these words meant. Can we be wrong in thinking that he had had some doubts about the way in which he had shut out questioning thoughts from his own mind, just as he had once severely closed his brother's mouth? The words must have been an answer to some inward misgivings, and I believe they represent an honest verdict that he had done right in thus quenching what most of us would call the light of God's great gift of reason in his soul. I say an honest verdict—yet it was an awful mistake, and became an almost final closure of his intellect to any ray which was not of the color favored by his Church authority.

Before leaving his inn to return home, he sat down on his bed and sobbed bitterly. When his servant asked what ailed him he could only answer, "I have a work to do in England." He had no misgivings about the nature and object of that work. He was not a knight errant in search of a cause, but the sworn knight of Catholicism shaken with an awful sense of duty to bring the Anglican Church into obedience to a well-defined rule of faith and practice. He foresaw great sorrows, bewilderments, toils, stumblings, and spiritual wounds, but believed himself a chosen servant, a predestined champion of "the Truth." Thus enclosed by religious certitude as a wall through which no thought of doubt should ever be allowed to break, his agitation was only caused by a tremulous sense of his own weakness and unwisdom as a soldier of the Church; and his desire for light was only an intense yearning for guidance in the practical steps of a course to which he stood committed with a devotion that regarded any re-consideration of his fundamental religious principles as a sin of rebellion.

Thus chafing with ardent longing to begin his great campaign, Newman was detained in Palermo waiting for a vessel. During this time he visited the churches and found his spirit strangely calmed by an influence which proceeded, as he thought, from the presence of departed saints:—

"The Fathers are in dust, yet live to God.
So says the Truth; as if the motionless clay
Still held the seeds of life beneath the sod
Smouldering and struggling till the judgment-day.

"And hence we learn with reverence to esteem
Of these frail houses, though the grave confines;
Sophist may urge his coming tests, and deem
That they are earth; but they are heavenly shrines."

In the Straits of Bonifacio his homebound ship was becalmed, and there, quietly waiting for his work, he wrote "Lead, kindly Light." That week of stillness on the calm, blue sea waiting for power to pass upon his way, was a type of the whole season spent abroad. It was a time of bodily revival and of mental recovery; a time of review and forecast; a time of high thinking, of gathering resolve, of concentrating purpose, and of girding on the harness for a future war. In that season the soul's energies, deprived of all vent in action, sought relief in poetical expression. It was one of those periods of luxuriant fancy and exalted sentiment which often come to gifted natures when a long rest has followed undue mental and emotional strain. It was a lyrical interlude between the prose chapters of a working life. Nearly all the hymns in the "Lyra Apostolica" were written during this brief period, and most of them on the voyage from Palermo to Marseilles.

Nothing could more painfully yet vividly illustrate Newman's religious temper and conviction of duty than an incident which occurred immediately on his arrival in England. While the touching strains of "Lead, kindly Light," were being written, Francis Newman was travelling home from Persia, where he had been working as a missionary, and whither he hoped to return with new colleagues. The two brothers reached their native land almost on the same day. These two men, each loving the other, met—they met twice—and then by John's act and solely on account of religious differences, they parted to meet no more for many years. This was one of those painful sacrifices of personal feeling to which John H. Newman was steeling his nature when he wrote "Lead, kindly Light!" It was one of those rough crags or brawling torrents he had nerved himself to cross. It was in unison with that horror of contact with heretics we have already noticed in his verse and with other lines of the same period on "Apostacy," in which, addressing France as he beheld her shores, he said:

"It is not safe to place the mind and heart
On brink of evil, or its flame to see,
Lest they should dizzy, or some taint impart,
Or to our sin a fascination be,
And so in silence I will now proclaim
Hate of thy present self, and scarce will sound thy name."

It is, indeed, a sample of the cruel way in which conscience may do violence to humanity, when

the outward light it has elected to follow is not the true light which shines from Him who made the heart. We also know from the pen of Francis Newman how terribly it worked to drive him out of touch with those who might have exerted a moderating influence on his mind.¹

Within a month of this estrangement, Keble preached his sermon on "National Apostacy," and so began the public history of the Oxford movement. Of that movement I cannot now write, except as it exhibits the cribbed and narrow sense in which Newman was a seeker after light. His chosen task was to examine the articles, homilies, creeds and rubrics of the Anglican Church to see how far they could be made to endure a Catholic interpretation. It was a perilous task for so agile and subtle an intellect. It was a monstrous task for one who was contending that the Anglican Church was a supreme authority in matters of faith and practice. Here was a man who hated and renounced private judgment, toiling to twist and turn the teachings of his teacher into harmony with true doctrine as conceived by himself! It is not strange that for many years half England suspected him of being a Jesuit in disguise, and read with angry dismay his scholastic refinements and word-splitting discussions. We can see now that all through he was honest, but he has confessed that he was then in a false position without knowing it. Slowly, very slowly, his position became plain. But at last, in the quiet rectory of Littlemore, it flashed upon him, that he was only kept out of the Roman Church because as a man possessed of reason he rejected Mariolatry, transubstantiation, and a few other irrational developments of doctrine. It was a humbling discovery. He had denounced private judgment, yet he had judged Rome! He had disowned Protestantism, yet he, a fallible child, had presumed to protest against what he dared to brand as a superstition. There was no new appeal of truth to his consciousness as a man before God. There was no process of rational inquiry closed by intelligent conviction. There was simply an act of submission. He had said, thirteen years before, "Obey the call," and now he must obey it himself, and he obeyed. Up to the moment when Father Dominic, the Passionist, laid hands on him as a convert, Newman did not believe the whole Roman creed. He simply took the new articles as a servant receives new orders from a new master. His own words are, "I did not believe the doctrine till I was a Catholic. I had no difficulty in believing it as soon as I believed that the Roman Church was the oracle of God." That such things were difficult to believe he admitted always. He never did believe them in the sense of mentally seeing and

confessing their truth, but simply took them over as dogmas to be held against all the assaults of reason within or from without.

It is pathetic to read this confession from a man so gifted with those intellectual powers which link us to the Creator, and enable us to have true discourse and commerce with each other and with the great universe. But the saddest part of the business has yet to be observed. When a man enters the Papal communion he is bound by her authority not only in intellect but in conscience, and must accept, and if needs be defend, whatever dogmas her casuists have framed if they have also received official sanction. Some of these dogmas affect the duty of truthfulness: e.g. Father Ligouri, an Italian Jesuit, wrote a book which received official sanction, and in it he affirms the duty of equivocation, even under a judicial oath, when a just cause arises. Charles Kingsley flung this book at Newman and challenged him either to repudiate or endorse its teaching. Newman defended the book. He said it was ethically sound, although he confessed that as an Englishman he did not like the Italian's doctrine and would never avail himself of such license. All honor to him as an Englishman! But what a pass for a Christian teacher to come to when officially obliged to defend a doctrine which as a plain Englishman he hated! He defended it, I believe, with sincere loathing, as, if commanded by the Papal conclave, he would have washed a leper's wounds or cleansed a malignant cancer. But if some years before one had said to him, "John H. Newman, you will one day write a defence of Ligouri," he would have answered—"Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing?"

It is unspeakably painful to write these things of a great leader who has but lately passed away. But because he was a man of so much charm and power we need to see and faithfully declare, that before he wrote "Lead, kindly Light," he had already done for his own mind what Romanists do for their cathedrals, when they almost exclude the daylight that their own tapers may shine with what seems a more religious light. His cry was not insincere, but his words did not express the thoughts which uninitiated minds suppose. The Hearer of Prayer was not unfaithful, for He refused no light which Newman craved. Therefore the Agnostic, who girds at prayer, cannot point his weapon with Newman's Hymn. The Romanist cannot urge that a mental condition which was already determined was reached as an answer to this subsequent plea. The Protestant need not be surprised that one whose cry for light was the outcome of a passionate hatred of private judgment should be allowed to drift, through years of unconscious inconsistency, to the only place where

¹ "Phases of Faith," p. 34.

Christians who darken reason can find an appropriate home. The Protestant position is often derided as an untenable halting-place betwixt the two goals represented by the brothers Newman. In reality, it is one which avoids the error and includes the truth of each. It admits, with John, that we need a light from heaven, yet it insists, with Francis, that our spiritual faculties are to be relied upon as capable of discerning spiritual truth. As against Francis, it denies that the seeing eye of the soul contains the whole truth we need. As against John, it denies that we are bound, or even free, to welcome any doctrine which is not self-commended to our consciousness as true, however venerable and august the authority by which it is presented. Francis virtually bids us be content with an eye; John bids us shut that eye and let the Church guide us as she will. Our wisdom is to say, "Lead, kindly Light," and then to open wide our eyes, assured that in God's light we shall see light, and our path shine more and more clearly, over moor and fen, and crag and torrent, until we come through Death's shadow to the Perfect Day.

NO LAY CRITICISM.

We are beginning to find out what was done at the meeting of the archbishops of the Roman Catholic Church, held in Chicago, last December. A communication which had been sent to the editors of the Catholic journals throughout the country lets in a good deal of light on the subject. Some of the Catholic journals had taken the liberty to criticise sharply the doings of the hierarchy. So far as we know that is a perfectly legitimate thing to do. A bishop, even in the exercise of his functions, is no more above criticism than is the President of the United States. An American citizen can dislike and can properly criticise, sometimes in sharp language, the policy or acts of the chief executive of the country, or of the Governor of his State. This is a part of the defenses of our liberty.

The communication sent to the editors, however, by the archbishops, contains the following very interesting admonition:

"It is a source of sadness and humiliation to us that our position forces us again and again to caution editors of Catholic newspapers that neither they themselves nor those who assist them should attack ecclesiastics, and above all bishops; nor should they constitute themselves the judges of Episcopal decisions, decrees and other such matters pertaining to the administration of a diocese, or find fault with them, and thus expose them to the ridicule of the faithful and non-Catholics. Rather let them heed the word of the Apostle and learn to be obedient and

submissive to superiors. Let them by their words and by their example teach that authorities be properly respected. They may well recall the wisdom-fraught councils of the great Father and teacher of the faithful.

"Above all, let the name of bishops be sacred among Catholic writers, for to them reverence is due, because of their high office and dignity. Nor let them think themselves privileged to examine critically what divinely appointed pastors, in exercise of their power, have established, for such conduct disturbs good order and creates intolerable confusion. This reverence, which no one may omit, should shine as an example in Catholic journalists.

"And lest the present evil, a daily growing source of scandal to Catholics and others, should continue to flourish, we judge well to meet it, not by cautions and advices merely, but also by ecclesiastical penalties. Wherefore, for the future, laymen or clerics who themselves, or through others associated with or encouraged by them, in public print assail by wanton words, ill-natured utterances, raileries, those in authority—much more if they presume to carp at or condemn a bishop's methods of administration—all these principals, partners and abettors, disturbers, temnors and enemies of ecclesiastical discipline, as they are, we declare guilty of gravest scandal, and thereby, their fault being proved, deserving of censure."

We should like to know upon what meat these our bishops feed that they have grown so great as to be above criticism by the press. Obedience and submission to superiors is right within the limits of administration, but opinion cannot be thus controlled nor the expression of it limited. A bishop has a right to govern his diocese, but he has no right to pretend that he never makes a mistake or cannot be criticised. We should like to know why a Catholic editor should not have the "privilege to examine critically what divinely appointed pastors have established?" Divinely appointed pastors can establish very unwise things. We are interested to know what those ecclesiastical penalties are by which editors are to be prevented from criticising a bishop's method of administration. We suppose the most effective method will be for the bishop to pronounce his censure upon the journal and forbid his people to subscribe to it. That has been tried in Cincinnati with great success. But it is not the American way of doing things, and we do not believe it is the Christian way of doing things.—*The Independent.*

A. D. 1900.

It is proposed to celebrate the conclusion of the nineteenth century of the Christian Era by

appropriate public services. The suggestion is made that the commemoration shall be held at one central locality. Chicago has begun to talk of entertaining the chief assembly. Some suggest a Fair. Paris announces a disposition to hold a World's Exposition.

We advocate separate celebrations in a number of localities, and celebrations by the churches. The Christian Era is to be the theme, therefore the churches ought to see to it that there shall be a Christian review of the centuries. Christian truth has produced Christian civilization. Let governments do what they will. Let those interested chiefly in material progress do what they will. The church should not fail to rehearse the world's indebtedness to the truths maintained by the followers of Christ. If there has been an evolution during these nineteen hundred years, it has been an evolution out of and by means of the person, work and words of the Lord Jesus Christ, as upheld and declared by Revelation and the Church of Christ. There should be a thoroughly Christian celebration of the close of this long and eventful period of human history, of the position attained so full of promise for the coming century.

In no one place can this commemoration be effectively observed. Everybody who has been in Chicago during the past fortnight has been impressed with the fact that a multitude of three hundred thousand men, women and children, added to a resident population of more than a million of souls, hinders and prevents an effective observance of anything. The crowd, the discomfort, the confusion and turmoil, limit the impressions of public exercises, rival and disolor them.

It will be better to celebrate nineteen hundred years of the power of the life and work of the Lord Jesus Christ, A. D. 1900, separately in every hamlet and in a score of centres in every city of the land.

The Churches should make sure that the celebration shall be of the CHRISTIAN ERA, and not an era of mechanical arts, or scientific research, or of governmental progress to constitutional liberty or to constitutional monarchies, or any other attainment. The distinctive character of the commemoration should be an affirmation of what has been wrought by the Gospel of the Son of God.—*The Christian Intelligencer.*

NEANDER, professor of theology in Berlin, was one day overtaken by a thunder-storm. He jumped into a cab, but could not give either the number of his house or the name of the street. The driver thought the man was mad, and was about to tell him to get out, when the professor espying a student, called out to him and said, "Just tell the man where I live." Neander's sis-

ter, who kept house for him, took fresh apartments nearer the university, as she thought the distance too great for her brother. A few days after their removal he complained of the long and tiring walk, and it then turned out that he had always gone first to the old lodgings, and so round to the university.—*Chronik der Zeit.*

BOOKS RECEIVED

Brooks, Phillips, D. D. Sermons. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Pp. 362, 75 cts.

Brown, Howard N. The Spiritual Life. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis. Pp. 198, \$1.00.

Carus, Dr. Paul. Primer of Philosophy. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. Pp. 222, \$1.00.

Carus, Dr. Paul. The Religion of Science. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. Pp. 103, 25 cts.

Catholic Papers. Philadelphia: J. J. McVey. Pp. 224, \$1.50.

Cuyler, Theo. L., D.D. The Young Preacher. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 97, 75 cts.

Dennis, Ja. S., D.D. Foreign Missions after a Century. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1893. c. 2-368 p. D. (Student's Lectures on Missions, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1893.) Cloth, \$1.50.

Drummond, Henry. Joy, Rest and Faith. New York: W. B. Ketcham. Pp. 16, 15 cts.

Farrar, F. W., D.D., F.R.S. The Lord's Prayer. New York: Thos. Whitaker. Pp. 279, \$1.50.

Findlay, Geo. G., B.A. The Study of the Bible. New York: W. B. Ketcham. Pp. 14, 15 cts.

Goren, Geo. A. The Witness to Immortality in Literature, Philosophy and Life. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 310, \$1.50.

Gorton, David A., M.D. The Monism of Man. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. 267, \$2.00.

Hopkins, Mark, LL.D. Modern Skepticism in its Relations to Young Men. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 39, 25 cts.

Jackson, Geo. Anson. The Son of a Prophet. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 305, \$1.25.

Literary Gems, 5th Series. Ideas of Truth—Ruskin, Conversation—De Quincy, Study of Poetry—Arnold. She Stoops to Conquer—Gladstone, House of Life—Rossetti. Eve of St. Agnes and Sonnets—Keats. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 75 cts. each.

Meyer, F. B., B.A. The Way into the Holiest. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 277, \$1.00.

Muller, F. Max. Three Introductory Lectures on the Science of Thought. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company. Pp. 28, 25 cts.

Otts, J. M. P., D.D., LL.D. Unsettled Questions Touching the Foundations of Christianity. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 169, \$1.00.

Pentecost, Geo. F., D.D. Bible Studies. The International S. S. Lesson for 1894. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 415, \$1.00.

Rankin, J. E. Ingleside Rhains. Washington, D. C.: Howard University Print. Pp. 184.

Rawlinson, Geo., M.A., F.R.G.S. The Story of Parthia. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Pp. 432, \$1.50.

Russell, A. P. Sub-Coelum. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 207, \$1.25.

Russell, Howard H., LL.B. A Lawyer's Examination of the Bible. New York and Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. Pp. 202, \$1.00.

Savage, M. J. Jesus and Modern Life. Boston: G. H. Ellis. Pp. 229, \$1.00.

Taylor, D. C. Jesus Christ Himself: The Sample, Source and Substance of Salvation. Gettysburg: J. E. Wible, Printer. Pp. 229.

Thatcher, O. J. A Sketch of the History of the Apostolic Church. New York and Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 312, \$1.25.

Thwing, Chas. Franklin. Within College Walls. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. Pp. 184, \$1.00.

West, Jas. H. Uplifts of Heart and Will. Boston: Geo. H. Ellis. Pp. 106, 50 cts.

Notes.

A CHOICE CHRISTMAS GIFT.—In the selection of a choice Christmas gift, or an addition to one's own library, both elegance and usefulness will be found combined in WEBSTER'S INTERNATIONAL DICTIONARY, which is the last of the various revisions and enlargements of the original Webster. The International represents fifty times the amount of literary labor that was expended upon the earliest edition, and is, without question, the most complete and reliable work of the kind ever published in a single volume. It is warmly endorsed by eminent scholars throughout the English-speaking world, and is a most useful book for the library, the school, the family, the student, and in fact for all who read or write the English language.

INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

ABBREVIATIONS OF MAGAZINE TITLES USED IN THIS INDEX.

Af. M. E. R.	African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	M. H.	Missionary Herald.
A. R.	Andover Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Miss. R.	Missionary Review.
B. Q. R.	Baptist Quarterly Review.	N. C. Q.	New Christian Quarterly.
B. S.	Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	N. H. M.	Newberry House Magazine.
B. W.	The Biblical World.	N. W.	The New World. (Quarterly.)
C. M. Q.	Canadian Methodist Quarterly.	O. D.	Our Day.
C. R.	Charities Review.	P. E. R.	Protestant Episcopal Review.
C. T.	Christian Thought. (Bi-monthly.)	P. M.	Preacher's Magazine.
Ch. Q. R.	Church Quarterly Review.	P. Q.	Presbyterian Quarterly.
Ex.	Expositor.	P. R. R.	Presbyterian and Reformed Review. (Quarterly.)
Ex. T.	Expository Times.	R. Q. R.	Reformed Quarterly Review.
G. W.	Good Words.	R. R. R.	Religious Review of Reviews.
H. R.	Homiletic Review.	S. M.	Sunday Magazine.
K. M.	Katholischen Missionen.	T. T.	The Thinker.
L. Q.	Lutheran Quarterly.	T. Tr.	The Treasury.
M. R.	Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	Y. R.	The Yale Review.

Unless otherwise specified, all references are to the October numbers of periodicals.

Abyssinia, The Church of, George H. Schodde, MissR.	Kilima Ndscharo, Auf dem, KM.
Africa, The Chicago Congress on, Frederick P. Noble, OD.	Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Christ, The, H. H. Wendt, ExT.
Apostolic Churches, The, VI., Robert A. Watson, PM.	Kreuz in Mexico und Centralamerika, Die vorchristlichen, KM.
Arabia, The Evangelization of, S. M. Zwemer, MissR.	Lachish, The Recovery of, Thomas Harrison, NHM.
Aristion, The Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark, F. C. Conybeare, Ex.	"Lead Kindly Light," T. Vincent Tynms, GW.
Asia Minor, A Summer Tour in, MissR.	Literary Culture, The Minister's, T. Harwood Pattison, HR.
Baptism, Spener on, E. J. Metzler, LQ.	Lord Unite in Prayer with His Disciples? Did Our, D. W. Forrest, Luke XV., Expository Note on, Alfred Roebuck, TT.
Bible, The Study of the, II., George G. Findlay, PM.	Mark, Aristion the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of, F. C. Conybeare, Ex.
Bible and Higher Criticism, The, Howard Osgood, CT.	Medicine and Religion, B. Anderson-Marsden, RRR, Sept.
Bible and Society, The, CT.	Methodist, An Old-Fashioned, SM.
Bible to Scientific Methods, Relations of the, S. C. Wells, LQ.	Missionen, Nachrichten aus den, KM.
Buddhism in England and America, Esoteric, OD.	Missions in Turkey, Herman W. Barnum, MissR.
Christ on Character, The Influence of, Lord Bishop of Ripon, GW.	Missions of the Church, Home, VIII, RRR, Sept.
Christ, Science and, IV., William W. Kinsley, BS.	Moody, D. L., and His Work, A. J. Gordon, MissR.
Christ, The Age Needing a Larger Conception of, Granville R. Pike, CT.	Morals, The Pulpit and Public, William J. Skillman, HR.
Christ, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of, H. H. Wendt, ExT.	Moses: His Life and its Lessons, XV, Mark Guy Pearse, PM.
Christ's Promise of Abundant Life, F. T. Bailey, TTr.	Moslem Cities, Christian Work in, James F. Riggs, MissR.
Christian Belief, The Source of Authority in, E. F. Bartholomew, LQ.	Moslem Mind Toward Christianity, The Attitude of the, MissR.
Christian Name, The, James Stalker, PM.	Mount, The Pattern in the, W. Milligan, TT.
Christian Work in Moslem Cities, James F. Riggs, MissR.	New Testament, Public and Private Epistles of the, Dunlap Moore, PRR.
Christian Worship, Fundamental Principles of, C. S. Albert, LQ.	New Testament Use of the Greek Mysteries, The, A. S. Carman, BS.
Christianity in South America, Perverted, John P. Newman, OD.	"Not as the World Giveth," A. G. Haywood, HR.
Church, The Aim and End of the, Wm. C. Schaeffer, RQR.	Novalis, G. M. Hammell, HR.
Church, The Model, Wilbur F. Crafts, HR.	Old Testament Character, Anomalies, W. G. Blaikie, TT.
Church and the Empire in the First Century, The, W. M. Ramsay, Ex.	Old Testament, Spinoza and the, B. Pick, BW.
Clerical Poets, English, Arthur L. Salmon, RRR, Sept.	Ordination, The Validity of Congregational, Wm. Elliot Griffis, BS.
Congo State, as a Factor in the Redemption of Africa, The, John A. Kasson, OD.	Pantheism's Destruction of Boundaries, Abraham Kuyper, MR.
Comte, Auguste, and Positivism, David H. Green, CT.	Pauline Epistles Classified According to External Evidence, The, Mrs. C. T. Mead, MR.
Crucifixion, On the Date of, the Arthur Wright, BW, Sept.	Paul's Conception of Christianity, St., A. B. Bruce, Ex.
Crusades, The, Philip Schaff, RQR.	Perfection and the Perfect, E. J. Wolf, HR.
Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood, The, G. A. Chadwick, Ex.	Philanthropic Institutions, VIII, RRR, Sept.
Derrick, William, B., Af. MER.	Philanthropy, The New, George Hodges, PER.
Divinely Beautiful, The, Dr. Nies, TTr.	Political Economy, James Theodore Holly, Af. MER.
Dogmatic Thoughts in Scandinavia, Recent, C. E. Lindberg, PRR.	Prayer, James Mudge, MR.
Ecclesiastical Questions in the National Council, A. Hastings Ross, BS.	Preaching? What is True, Wilbur C. Newell, HR.
Educated Men, The Mission of, S. G. Valentine, LQ.	Presiding Elder System, The, A. S. Jackson, Af. MER.
Educational Work, Our, John M. Henderson, Af. MER.	Protestantism in North America, William Henry Roberts, CT.
ekaborev in St. John, xix, 13, On the Proper Rendering of, Prof. Roberts Ex.	Protestant Pulpit, The, Philip Schaff, TTr.
Establishment, The Future of the Scottish, RRR, Sept.	Reading, On, J. B. Kieffer, RQR.
Evolution and Creation, James E. Poincexter, PER.	Reading, The Art of, X. Canon Fleming, RRR, Sept.
Evolution and Evolution, B. P. Bowne, MR.	Religion for All Time, A. T. H. Pearne, MR.
Evolution and the Doctrine of the Incarnation, Prof. Bernard, TT.	Religion, The Source of Authority in, David H. Bauslin, LQ.
Faith and Works, E. V. Gerhart, RQR.	Religious History of New England, On the Early, J. G. Faulkner, RQR.
Feet-Washing, The, W. F. Gess, TT.	Republican Party a Future? Yes, Has the, William B. Derrick, Af. MER.
Finite and Infinite, B. B. Fry, BS.	Russia, Evangelical, P. Z. Easton, MissR.
Future Worlds, The, Burdett Hart, TTr.	Samaritan Pentateuch, A Critical Copy of the, W. Scott Watson, PRR.
Gambling in Colleges, W. J. Mutch, CT.	Sangamner and Akola, KM.
God's Existence, Apart from Revelation, The Four Arguments for, J. Albert Jonson, Af. MER.	Science and Christ, IV, William W. Kingsley, BS.
Golden Calf at Dan? Was there a, F. W. Farrar, Ex.	Scottish Establishment, The Future of the, RRR.
Hebrew Historiography, Theo. G. Soares, BW, Sept.	Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries, Light on, William H. Ward, HR.
Helena, St., S. Baring Gould, NHM.	Sepulchral Cross-Slab, Some Ancient, Kate E. Styan, SM.
Hexateuch, Dr. Briggs' Higher Criticism of the, Wm. H. Green, PRR.	Socialist in London, A Scientific, Frances E. Willard, OD.
Higher Criticism, Christ at the Bar of the, David Jas. Burrell, CT.	Spinoza and the Old Testament, B. Pick, BW, Sept.
Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch, Dr. Briggs' Wm. H. Green, PRR.	Star Wormwood, The, W. H. Wynn, LQ.
Higher Criticism, The Bible and, Howard Osgood, CT.	Sunday Reading, Books for Young People's, Estelle M. Hurli, CF.
Higher Criticism Under Review, E. J. Curtis, CT.	Sunday, The Christian Observance of, S. A. Wallace, PER.
Historiography, Hebrew, Theo. G. Soares, BW, Sept.	Sunday Worth to Labor, What Is, Joseph Cook, OD.
Homer, A Study of, Lewis B. Moore, Af. MER.	Supreme Law of the Moral World, The, John Milton Williams, BS.
Hymns, Some of Our, M. Marshall, RRR, Sept.	Syria, The Coast of, William Wright, SM.
"In Many Parts and in Many Fashions," B. F. Westcott, ExT.	Tariff Reform and the Laboring Classes, Af. MER.
Iona of the South, The, Hugh Macmillan, TT.	Tell-el-Amara Tablets, The Testimony of, Henry Hayman, BS.
Isaiah VII., 14, The Virgin of, J. W. Garvey, TTr.	Tennyson's "In Memoriam," Studies in, Mary A. Woods, ExT.
Japan, The Year in, George William Knox, MissR.	Theology, Our Relation to German, William Rupp, RQR.
Jesus, Wendt on the Self-Witness of, James Orr, ExT.	Thought, Leaders of, R. R. Downs, Af. MER.
KAΘΗΜΕΝΟΣ in Matt. IV, 16, On, Robert Dick Wilson, PRR.	Trinity, The, J. A. Broadus, TTr.
Keswick at Home, George H. C. Macgregor, ExT.	

Turanian Blood in the Anglo-Saxon Race, M. V. B. Knox, MR.
 Vinet, Alexander, Vernon Bartlett, ExT.
 Voice Culture as a Preparation for the Pulpit, M. C. Howey, HR.
 Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture, The, Benjamin B. Warfield, PRR.
 Winchester Cathedral, Canon Benham, GW.
 Witness, The Threefold Concordant, Wm. C. Langdon, PER.

CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

The African M. E. Church Review.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1893.

Political Economy.
 Has the Republican Party a Future? Yes.
 Leader of Thought.
 Tariff Reform and the Laboring Classes.
 Rev. W. B. Derick, D.D.
 The Four Arguments for God's Existence Apart from Revelation.
 "The Shallows Murmur, but the Deeps Are Dumb."
 A Study of Homer.
 Our Educational Work.
 The Presiding Elder System.

Atlantic Monthly.

BOSTON, NOVEMBER, 1893.

The Man from Aidone, IV-VI. Elisabeth Cavazza.
 Along the Hillsborough. Bradford Torrey.
 Morn after Morn. Stuart Sterne.
 Talk at a Country House. Sir Edward Strachey.
 The Pilgrim in Devon. Alice Brown.
 The Beauport Loup-Garou. Mary Hartwell Catherwood.
 Two Modern Classicists in Music. Part Two. William F. Athorp.
 Catholicity in Musical Taste. Owen Wister.
 His Vanished Star, X., XI. Charles Egbert Craddock.
 Courts of Conciliation in America. Nicolay Grevstad.
 School Libraries. H. E. Scudder.
 Spectacled Schoolboys. Ernest Hart.
 An Ionian Freeze. Francis Howard Williams.
 The Hungry Greeklings. Emily James Smith.
 A Few Story-Tellers, Old and New.
 Irish Idylls.

The Bibliotheca Sacra.

OVERLIN, OCTOBER, 1893.

Ecclesiastical Questions in the National Council.
 The Validity of Congregational Ordination.
 The New Testament Use of the Greek Mysteries.
 The Supreme Law of the Moral World.
 Science and Christ (iv.)
 Finite and Infinite.
 The Testimony of the Tell-el-Amarna Tablets.

The Biblical World.

CHICAGO, SEPTEMBER, 1893.

On the Date of the Crucifixion.
 Hebrew Historiography.
 The Living Word: Hebrews 4:12.
 Spinoza and the Old Testament.

The Century Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

Portrait of Edwin Booth. Frontispiece.
 To Lowell, on His Fortieth Birthday. Ralph Waldo Emerson.
 Fifth Avenue. Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer.
 The Yellow Globe. Alexander W. Drake.
 My First Lions. Hunting Fierce Game in Eastern Africa. H. W. Seton-Carr.
 The Facts of Kitwyk. Anna Eichberg King.
 The Watchman. Mary Hallock Foote.
 Artists' Adventures: The Rush to Death. Walter Shirlaw.
 The Bowers of Paradise. Clinton Scollard.
 A Morning in Spring. ("The Century's" American Artists' Series) Horatio Walker.
 The Casting Vote. (In Two Parts.) Part I. Charles Egbert Craddock.
 John Henderson, Artist. A Psychological Study from Life. George Kennan.
 George Michel. The Painter of Montmartre. Virginia Vaughan.
 Taking Napoleon to St. Helena. Part II. (Conclusion.) John R. Glover.
 Bismarck at Friedrichsruh. Eleonora Kinnicutt.
 Tramping with Tramps. Josiah Flynt.
 Farewell to Italy. Robert Underwood Johnson.
 Escape of the Confederate Secretary of War. John Taylor Wood.
 A Prayer in Thessaly. John Hay.
 Humor, Wit, Fun, and Satire. (Prefatory Note.) James Russell Lowell.
 Memories and Letters of Edwin Booth. William Bispham.
 Combatants. Florence Earle Coates.
 Mr. Cummin's Relinquishment. Richard Malcom Johnston.
 The Burden of Age. Edith M. Thomas.

Christian Thought.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Bible and Society.

The Bible and Higher Criticism.
 Higher Criticism Under Review.
 Christ at the Bar of the Higher Criticism.
 Auguste Comte and Positivism.
 The Age Needing a Larger Conception of Christ.
 Protestantism in North America.
 Books Old and New for Young People's Sunday Reading.
 Gambling in Colleges.

The Cosmopolitan Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

Autobiographical Notes. Franz von Lenbach.
 Hagar. (Poem.) Eliza P. Nicholson.
 Busy Days of an Idler in Mexico. Ellen M. Slayden.
 The Mocking Bird. (Poem.) John B. Tabb.
 In Hop-picking Time. Ninetta Eames.
 The Bolero in Seville. George W. Edwards.
 Some English Forms of Invitation. Adam Badeau.
 The Eskimo Maiden's Romance. Mark Twain.
 The Leaf. Julie M. Lippmann.
 American Notes. I. Walter Besant.
 Measures of Lawn. Mrs. Roger A. Pryor.
 A Doll-Home. H. H. Boyesen.
 Dealing in the Futures. Alice W. Rollins.
 The Writing Material of Antiquity. George Ebers.
 Among the Pines. (Poem.) Virginia W. Cloud.
 Letters of an Altrurian Traveller. W. D. Howells.

The Expositor.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1893.

Aristion, the Author of the Last Twelve Verses of Mark.
 Was There a Golden Calf at Dan?
 St. Paul's Conception of Christianity.
 The Church and the Empire in the First Century.
 On the Proper Rendering of *εαθεεν* in St. John, xix. 13.
 The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Issue of Blood.

The Expository Times.

EDINBURGH, OCTOBER, 1893.

Studies in Tennyson's "In Memoriam."
 "In Many Parts and in Many Fashions."
 Alexander Vinet.
 The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Christ. I.
 Wendt on the Self-Witness of Jesus.
 Keswick at Home.

Godey's Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

The Flower of Gala Water. (Complete Novel.) Amelia E. Barr.
 The Bachelor Girl. Oliver Bell Bunce.
 At the Summit. (Poem.) W. G. Henderson.
 Water Color Portrait. Miss Bertha Ludington Barnes, of Chicago.
 A Holiday in Spain. Floyd B. Wilson.
 An Ariadna of To-Day. (Poem.) Daniel Doane Bidwell.
 A Pretty Mocking of the Life. Eola Willis.
 Elizabethan Love Song. (Poem.) Sarah King Wiley.
 Flower Tales. Laura MacHenry.
 Water Color Portrait of Mrs. Arthur Rotch.
 Sketches of Mrs. Arthur Rotch, of Boston, and Miss Bertha Ludington Barnes, of Chicago.
 New England's Children. A Thanksgiving Story. George I. Putnam.
 Who Knows? Quatrains. Clark W. Bryan.
 Jeannette's Cupid. (A Sketch.) J. M. Lévéque.

Good Words.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1893.

To Right the Wrong. Chaps. xxxii-xxxiv.
 "Lead, Kindly Light."
 Flodden or Branxton?
 Mars as a World.
 Obnoxious to the Poets.
 Summer and Autumn Fancies.
 Reminiscences of Frederika Bremer.
 Onward.
 Winchester Cathedral.
 The Merciful Mandarin.
 Früken Bergliot.
 The Influence of Christ on Character. X.

Harper's Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

From Tabrez to Ispahan. Edwin Lord Weeks.
 The Handsome Humes. (A Novel.) Part VI. William Black.
 The Decadent Movement in Literature. Arthur Symons.
 Love and Music. (A Poem.) John Hay.
 Along the Bayou Teche. Julian Ralph.
 An Indian Commonwealth. Rezin W. McAdam.
 Left in Charge. (A Poem.) Anna C. Brackett.
 London in the Season. Richard Harding Davis.
 In the Early Days. (A Poem.) Alice Archer Sewall.
 The Frog that Played the Trombone. Brander Matthews.
 Arbitration. F. R. Couder.
 Vorbei. (A Story.) Annie Nathan Meyer.
 Riders of Turkey. Colonel T. A. Dodge, U.S.A.
 Em'ly. (A Story.) Owen Wister.
 Apollo in Picardy. Walter Pater.

A Reminiscence of Stephen A. Douglas. Daniel Roberts.
A Summer Day. (A Poem.) Robert Burns Wilson.

The Homiletic Review.

NEW YORK, TORONTO, LONDON, OCTOBER, 1893.
The Minister's Literary Culture.

The Model Church.
What Is True Preaching?
Homiletical Suggestions.
Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. IX.
Perfection and the Perfect.
The Pulpit and Public Morals.
Voice Culture as a Preparation for the Pulpit.
"Not as the World Giveth."

Die Katholischen Missionen.

OCTOBER, 1893.

Die Vorchristlichen Kreuze in Mexico und Centralamerika.
Sangammer und Akola.
Auf dem Kilima Ndscharo.
Nachrichten aus den Missionen.

Lippincott's Magazine.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1893.
An Unsatisfactory Lover. Mrs. Hungerford ("The Duchess").
Golf. (Athletic Series.) John Gilmer Speed.
The Lapp Maiden's Song. (Poem.) Hjalmar Hjorth Boyesen.
The Rustlers. (Lippincott's Notable Stories, No. IX.) Alice MacGowan.
Progress in Local Transportation. Lewis M. Haupt.
The Wind and the Tree. (Poem.) Bliss Carman.
How the Light Came. J. Armoy Knox.
An Old-Fashioned Garden. Charles C. Abbott.
Expensive Religion. Phil Stansbury.
The Awakening. (Poem.) Richard E. Burton.
Why the Body Should be Cultivated. Wilton Tournier.
Two Turnings. (Poem.) Florence E. Pratt.
A Three-Volume Tract. Frederic M. Bird.
Men of the Day. M. Crofton.

The Lutheran Quarterly.

GETTYSBURG, OCTOBER, 1893.

Fundamental Principles of Christian Worship.
The Source of Authority in Religion.
The Mission of Educated Men.
The Source of Authority in Christian Belief.
Spener on Baptism.
The Star, Wormwood.
Relations of the Bible to Scientific Methods.

McClure's Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

Frank R. Stockton. Frontispiece.
Real Conversations. III. A Dialogue between Frank R. Stockton and Edith M. Thomas. Recorded by Miss Thomas.
Incurable. A Ghetto Tragedy. I. Zangwill.
"Human Documents." Portraits of Distinguished People at Different Periods of Their Lives.
The Personal Force of Cleveland E. Jay Edwards.
Patti at Craig-y-Nos. Arthur Warren.
Once Aboard the Lugger. O.
Song. Thomas Lovell Beddoes.
Four Hundred Degrees Below Zero. An Interview with Professor James Dewar. Henry J. W. Dam.
The House with the Tall Porch. Gilbert Parker.
Stranger than Fiction. The Brontës *al fresco*. The Brontës and the Ghosts. The Devil and the Potato Blight. The Great Brontë Fight.
Dr. William Wright.
The Hypnotic Experiments of Doctor Luys. R. H. Sherard.
The Surgeon's Miracle. Joseph Kirkland.

Methodist Review.

NEW YORK, SEPTEMBER, OCTOBER, 1893.

Evolution and Evolution.
Turanian Blood in the Anglo-Saxon Race.
Prayer.
Novalis.
The Pauline Epistles Classified According to External Evidence.
Down with the Old—Up with the New—"A Religion for All Time."
Pantheism's Destruction of Boundaries.

The Missionary Review.

NEW YORK, LONDON, TORONTO, OCTOBER, 1893.

Christian Work in Moslem Cities.
The Attitude of the Moslem Mind Towards Christianity.
Missions in Turkey.
The Year in Japan.
The Church in Abyssinia.
Evangelical Russia.
D. L. Moody and His Work.
A Summer Tour in Asia Minor.

The Newberry's House Magazine.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Local Government Bill, 1893.
The Recovery of Lachish.

A Bush Burial.
A Real Repentance.
St. Helena.
The "No Less Female."
An Incident of the Seventeenth Century.
A Visit to the Queen of Madagascar.
Galileo's Daughter.

Our Day.

BOSTON, CHICAGO, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Chicago Congress on Africa.
The Congo State as a Factor in the Redemption of Africa.
A Scientific Socialist in London.
Perverted Christianity in South America.
Esoteric Buddhism in England and America.
What is Sunday Worth to Labor?

The Protestant Episcopal Review.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, VIRGINIA, OCTOBER, 1893.

The New Philanthropy.
The Threefold Concordant Witness.
Evolution and Creation.
The Christian Observance of Sunday.

The Preachers' Magazine.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Christian Name.
Moses: His Life and its Lessons. XV.
The Apostolic Churches: Their Doctrine and Fellowship. VI.
The Study of the Bible. II.
Homiletics.

The Presbyterian and Reformed Review.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER 1893.

Dr. Briggs' Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch.
Recent Dogmatic Thought in Scandinavia.
The Westminster Doctrine of Holy Scripture.
A Critical Copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch.
Public and Private Epistles of the New Testament.
On KAΘHMENOΣ in Matt. iv. 16.

The Reformed Quarterly Review.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Crusades.
Faith and Works.
Our Relation to German Theology.
The Aim and End of the Church.
On the Early Religious History of New England.
On Reading.

The Religious Review of Reviews.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER, 1893.

The Future of the Scottish Establishment.
English Clerical Poets.
Medicine and Religion.
The Art of Reading. X.
Some of our Hymns. II.
Home Missions of the Church. VIII.
Philanthropic Institutions. VIII.

Scribner's Magazine.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1893.

Madame Roland at the Conciergerie. Frontispiece.
In Camp with the Katchins. Col. H. E. Colville.
Indian Summer. Archibald Lampman.
The Proud Pynsets. Octave Thanet.
Love's Guerdon. Elizabeth C. Cardozo.
Madame Roland. Ida M. Tarbell.
Glimpses of the French Illustrators—II. (Conclusion.) F. N. Double-day.
The House of Commons. Augustine Birrell.
The Picturesque Side. F. Hopkinson Smith.
Mr. Freeman at Home. Delia Lyman Porter.
The Copperhead. Chapters XII-XIV. Harold Frederic.
Education for Girls in France. Katharine de Forest.
A Laggard in Love. Martha McCulloch Williams.
Historic Moments: The Nomination of Lincoln. Isaac H. Bromley.

The Sunday Magazine.

LONDON, OCTOBER, 1893.

One in Charity.
The Coast of Syria.
An Ideal Woman of Olden Days.
An Old-Fashioned Methodist.
Some Ancient Sepulchral Cross-Slabs.
Jubilee Remembrances of Persons I Have Met.

The Treasury.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1893.

The Divinely Beautiful.
The Trinity.
The Future Worlds.
Christ's Promise of Abundant Life.
The Protestant Pulpit.
The Virgin of Isaiah, vii. 14.